

March 11, 2008



**TRANSCRIPT
March 11, 2008**

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councilmember Michael Knapp, President
Councilmember Roger Berliner
Councilmember Valerie Ervin
Councilmember George Leventhal

Councilmember Phil Andrews, Vice President
Councilmember Marc Elrich
Councilmember Nancy Floreen
Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg



March 11, 2008

1 President Knapp,
2 Good morning everyone, before we get started I would just ask us all to rise briefly for a
3 moment of silence and reflection. Thank you very much. We begin our morning -- our
4 session this morning with a proclamation to Miss. Sarah Boltuck, recognizing her work
5 for 17-year-olds to vote in Maryland primaries, being presented to her by
6 Councilmember Berliner.

7
8 Councilmember Berliner,
9 I should be a pro at this.

10
11 President Knapp,
12 That's right. You're an expert.

13
14 Councilmember Berliner,
15 It's an honor to be -- .

16
17 President Knapp,
18 Don't forget to turn on the microphone.

19
20 Councilmember Berliner,
21 I'm a slow learner. But it is an honor for me to be here. It is an honor for me to be
22 presenting this to Sarah. As you know, under Sarah's leadership and with the help of
23 her father and some lawyer that has some relationship to my office, Sarah was able to
24 convince the Attorney General and the Maryland court system that the 17-year-olds
25 should have the right to vote if their birthday falls before the primary -- before the
26 general election; and then was able to convince that this was also true for our school
27 boards as well. So it was sweeping victory. It was about voter rights and making sure
28 that our young people have that right and bet the ability to exercise that. So it's really
29 quite remarkable on your part. Let me read this. It is a proclamation; Whereas, the
30 active participation of all citizens in the political process is the hallmark of a democratic
31 nation; and, Whereas, after receiving a rejection letter from the Montgomery County
32 Board of Elections, which stated she was too young to vote in the primaries because
33 she was not yet eighteen years old, Sarah Boltuck, who was going to be eighteen at the
34 time of the general election, fought back. And, Whereas, with the help of her father,
35 Richard Boltuck, and Maryland State Senator Jamie Raskin, Sarah led a campaign all
36 the way to the Maryland State Board of Elections and the State Attorney General's
37 Office to secure the right to vote in the primaries for herself and others who would be
38 seventeen at the time of the primaries, but eighteen by the time of the general election;
39 and, Whereas, Maryland's top legal minds restored the right of suffrage in the critical
40 state primaries to at least 50,000 residents who would have turned eighteen between
41 the February 12 primaries and the November 4 general election; and, Whereas, Sarah
42 Boltuck was determined to prove a class of residents was going to be deprived of the
43 constitutional right to vote and not only saw that injustice but acted to right that wrong.
44 Now therefore be it further resolved that the County Council of Montgomery County,



March 11, 2008

1 Maryland, congratulates Sarah Boltuck. And be it further resolved that the County
2 Council takes this opportunity to thank Sarah Boltuck for her dedication and hard work
3 and to which her well in all her present and future endeavors. Sarah, would you like to
4 say something?

5
6 President Knapp,
7 The pressure is on.

8
9 Councilmember Berliner,
10 No pressure. You've already done your job.

11
12 Sarah Boltuck,
13 Thank you so much though for giving this opportunity to at least acknowledge
14 everything that everybody's worked so hard for in this campaign to restore the right of
15 17-year-olds to vote.

16
17 Councilmember Berliner,
18 Well, thank you.

19
20 President Knapp,
21 Thank you very much.

22
23 Councilmember Berliner,
24 Congratulations. Oh, come.

25
26 President Knapp,
27 Congratulations, and thank you very much for your leadership. We now turn to general
28 business Ms. Lauer.

29
30 Linda Lauer,
31 Just wanted to get the word out, the HHS Committee meeting on Monday, March 17, is
32 canceled. That's our only change. And we do have a few petitions we received this
33 week. One was supporting funds for Senior Services; another supporting full funding for
34 the library's budget and then supporting an addition to Sherwood Elementary School.
35 Thank you.

36
37 President Knapp,
38 Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have minutes to approve?

39
40 Council Clerk,
41 Yes. The minutes of February 25 and 26, 2008.

42
43 President Knapp,
44 Is there a motion?



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Floreen,
3 I'll move approval.

4
5 President Knapp,
6 Moved by Councilmember Floreen.

7
8 Councilmember Ervin,
9 Second.

10
11 President Knapp,
12 Seconded by Councilmember Ervin. We have the approval of the minutes before us; all
13 in favor please indicate by raising your hand. And that is almost unanimous. Now it's
14 unanimous among all those -- thank you. We turn to the Consent Calendar. Is there a
15 motion?

16
17 Vice President Andrews,
18 So moved.

19
20 President Knapp,
21 Moved by Council Vice President Andrews.

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Second.

25
26 President Knapp,
27 Seconded by Councilmember Floreen. Are there any comments? Councilmember
28 Elrich.

29
30 Councilmember Elrich,
31 Are we going to get a fiscal impact statement on the Gaithersburg Enterprise Zone
32 request? Because I didn't see any numbers other than -- and then a reference to the
33 County would be giving up property taxes and impact fees. I'm not even sure whether
34 we give up the impact fees or not. But there's certainly -- there's no number in terms of
35 what we're giving up.

36
37 President Knapp,
38 I certainly think we could probably get one.

39
40 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
41 I would imagine.

42
43 President Knapp,
44 I see heads -- .



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Floreen,
3 Come to the PHED Committee, won't it?
4

5 President Knapp,
6 I see heads nodding up and down. So we will get a fiscal statement that accompanies
7 that when it comes to the PHED Committee. Okay?
8

9 Councilmember Leventhal,
10 Just a point on that, Mr. President. Unless, I'm mistaken, impact fees collected in
11 Gaithersburg city must be spent in Gaithersburg city. So for the city of Gaithersburg to
12 request this it's no, I mean, the County overall isn't losing anything other than that which
13 would be spent within Gaithersburg anyway.
14

15 Councilmember Elrich,
16 [Inaudible] property taxes.
17

18 President Knapp,
19 We'll get that when we get to the -- when we take it up for consideration. Okay, I see no
20 further comments on the Consent Calendar. All in favor of the Consent Calendar
21 indicate by raising your hand? That is unanimous. Okay. We now turn to our status
22 report on the FY09-14 CIP. Dr. Orlin. For everyone who didn't turn to the second page,
23 we've got a picture of the train wreck. He's just trying to get our attention.
24

25 Glenn Orlin,
26 Let me get your attention.
27

28 President Knapp,
29 So, I just wanted to have Dr. Orlin walk us through -- he does this each week, but just to
30 give us a sense of where we are and as we start our process, I thought it would be
31 helpful for him just to give us an update as we're going further or closer to getting
32 towards getting to a reconciliation. So, Dr. Orlin, how we doing?
33

34 Glenn Orlin,
35 We've got trouble in River City -- and I'm not going to sing the whole song.
36

37 President Knapp,
38 Thank you, we appreciate that.
39

40 Glenn Orlin,
41 If I could draw your attention to the chart at the bottom of page one. There are several
42 things we try to reconcile at the end of the CIP. One of which is General Obligation
43 Bonds. That's the main one for spending affordability reasons. And we used the
44 Executive's recommendations, not the specific recommendations he's making for



March 11, 2008

1 projects, but his total amount of recommendations as a measuring point because his
2 recommendations do fall within the guidelines. And what we find right now is if you take
3 the amount of GO bonds that the Council is assuming to date and subtract off the
4 recordation tax and school impact tax, which hasn't been assigned to projects yet, we're
5 about \$267 million or \$268 million over the Executive in the six-year period. And
6 particularly over in years 2, 3, and 4 -- fiscal years '10, '11, and '12. Those are the really
7 serious years for being over. To give you a sense as to how far over that is, go to the
8 next page and you see the next chart. The six-year total is almost as big as the reserve
9 itself. We've always carried about a 12 to 14% reserve; this eats up all of it except for a
10 tiny bit. And, in fact, it far exceeds the reserve in fiscal years '10, '11 and '12, which
11 can't happen. So these numbers are going to have to come considerably down. At
12 reconciliation what my charge is, at least to present you with a CIP which is within the
13 guidelines, but I can really only do that if -- I can only do that and not affect major policy
14 decisions unless you come in with -- finish with the CIP towards reconciliation, which is
15 under \$100 million. If it's \$276 million or over, that's just untenable. What I'll have to
16 then do is show recommendations which take projects that you put in and take them out
17 entirely, or delay them three or four years. And I can do that and you can nod your
18 heads and say that's all right, but from a decision-making and public-policy standpoint, I
19 think that's a very bad way to go. Because you're making decisions as you go along, the
20 public is following all of this, and then suddenly at the 11th hour and 59th minute I show
21 up with a memo, everyone sort of nods their head, and everyone says what happened
22 to my project. So it's -- we need to figure out a way as you're going through this, both
23 last week's decisions and the decisions coming up, to bring these numbers way, way
24 down. Now there is a philosophy, I know it has been happened last week to actually
25 fund fully some projects which are -- had just been in design, and the idea is rather than
26 having the reserve that we've have, take some of that reserve essentially for projects.
27 And if that's the direction that the Council wants to go, you can do that to a limited
28 degree, and I think what would happen is that we would -- our final bonds figure would
29 be somewhat higher than the Executive's, and that's probably okay. Because you're just
30 taking some that was in the reserve and putting it in specific projects; but only some.
31 Not nearly to the degree that we've done so far [inaudible]. The other background in this
32 of course is that we're assuming in all of this so far that the Council is -- the starting
33 pointing is the Board's request for the school system, rather than the Executive's. And
34 so right there, there's a \$75 million increase over the Executive for the six-year period,
35 and actually \$112 million increase of the first four years. Because what the Executive
36 did was cut \$112 million in actually years 2, 3, and 4, and then added back about \$40
37 million or so, if that's the right number, in the last two years. So there's that. The other
38 two issues are less serious. Current revenue is over by about \$5 million in FY09. That's
39 serious because that's the money that competes directly with the operating budget.
40 There are bigger numbers out in fiscal years '13 and '14, but those aren't nearly as
41 serious because, as we've talked about earlier, the Executive took out about \$100
42 million of the current revenue in the later years. And really that depends upon what you
43 think is going to happen in the longer term in terms of the County's revenues. If you
44 think it's going to come back really healthy, having those numbers out in years '13 and



March 11, 2008

1 '14 probably isn't so bad. We may want to bring them down a little bit, but that's not so
2 bad. And finally Park and Planning bonds is a little bit over but it's in the last year, and
3 so that's not serious at all. It's really the bond issue -- bonds which are the key. And
4 we'll probably do this again next week and see where you are and just keep going back.

5
6 President Knapp,

7 Okay. We have some questions. Councilmember Floreen.

8
9 Councilmember Floreen,

10 Thank you. When in the -- what are the most critical years in the CIP?

11
12 Glenn Orlin,

13 Well in terms of trying to make a match it would be years fiscal years, '10, '11 and '12.

14
15 Councilmember Floreen,

16 '10, '11 and '12, and that's where the higher numbers are?

17
18 Glenn Orlin,

19 Yeah. And that's typical actually. It usually turns out the first year is not a bad year
20 because most of the money that's programmed in the first year of a six-year CIP is
21 usually projects that are already under construction, and you don't do much to that. It's
22 really more in the second, third and fourth, because you may be adding a new project,
23 which is maybe in design for the first year or two, which is very small. But the big money
24 then comes in years three and four, or maybe two, three and four. This is not atypical.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,

27 So, we are still a little schizophrenic on our CIP planning, I see, amongst committees, in
28 terms of what we put in for construction and what we haven't put in for construction.
29 We'll talk about that in a second. But the issue I wanted to understand is with respect to
30 our own rules, with respect to spending affordability. How does this impact that?

31
32 Glenn Orlin,

33 Okay, the spending affordability guidelines apply to the first year, the second -- so
34 FY09, FY10, and then the six-year total. So that FY09-14 column. Essentially those first
35 three columns on these charts are the guidelines. Although we treat each year as if they
36 were a guideline, because unless -- this is one of the reasons why we stayed with the
37 \$300 million a year levels because if you have a big bump in say FY11, then you're
38 building a problem for you the next time around. So we're trying to keep all the levels at
39 -- .

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,

42 But keeping in mind this is not a precise science. We'd all like to think it was; it's not. We
43 can vote to override those numbers.



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,
2 You need seven votes.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 So that makes the CIP under this scenario a seven-vote CIP?

6
7 Glenn Orlin,
8 Absolutely.

9
10 Councilmember Floreen,
11 Okay, I wanted to clarify that point as we look for these -- .

12
13 Glenn Orlin,
14 Let me hasten that; remember the guidelines that you adopted brought you right to the
15 edge of the 10% of percentage of the operating budget being paid for out of debt
16 service. And one of the things the Council has always tried to do, amongst other things,
17 is to try to stay within the 10%.

18
19 Councilmember Floreen,
20 Sure.

21
22 President Knapp,
23 Right.

24
25 Glenn Orlin,
26 So anything above that is going to bust it.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 That's the conversation we'll have at some later point. Okay, thank you.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 Councilmember Elrich.

33
34 Councilmember Elrich,
35 Just a couple questions for edification; what is the consequence of going above the
36 10%?

37
38 Glenn Orlin,
39 Danger of endangering a AAA bond rating.

40
41 Councilmember Elrich,
42 Is that a clear message that we have from somebody that 10.5 or 11% endangers the
43 AAA bond rating?



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,

2 Well, the guidelines that most jurisdictions use in this region is 10%. And obviously, it's
3 a bundle of things. It's not necessary it's going to happen, but it's one of the things we to
4 look at.

5
6 Councilmember Elrich,

7 But, do the bond rating agencies have any published guidelines that they -- ?

8
9 Glenn Orlin,

10 What I've seen is that 10% is their standard.

11
12 Councilmember Elrich,

13 I just want to understand.

14
15 Glenn Orlin,

16 Let me enhance your point. In the '90s it was fairly regular that we were actually
17 between 10 and 11%. And we essentially said we've got to stay within at least 11%. But
18 since the last, I don't know, seven or eight years at least, it's not been difficult at all to
19 stay within 10. And I think that's the way we're judged.

20
21 Councilmember Elrich,

22 And 11% would give us how much additional revenue if we used it; \$30 million?

23
24 Glenn Orlin,

25 I'd have to go back and check, something like that.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,

28 But not a huge amount; not enough to solve?

29
30 Glenn Orlin,

31 No.

32
33 Councilmember Elrich,

34 And I guess my other comment is, I mean, we're going to -- I think it's very hard for the
35 committees to parse what's going on a week-by-week basis because we don't see what
36 everybody else is doing. And I also think it would be absolutely unfair to say to you now
37 that we've filled up this budget, would you please come back with this with 300 million
38 because this is basically -- has to be our process. And we have to own these priorities.
39 And you would be in big trouble if people, like you said most unhappy if you were to
40 come back and do this. And I think that's the conversation that the Council has to have
41 is confront these rather real numbers and decide which of these projects we want to
42 make real, and which ones aren't going to be real.

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Let me just say that the Council will do that. We will not send that off to Dr. Orlin to
2 come back and give us a nice pretty package all wrapped up in a bow or with various
3 changes. We're going to have to do that as a Council. And how we do that and what the
4 process will be, we haven't figured it out exactly yet. But we will -- we'll bring all those
5 pieces back. The other point I just want to add to that, Marc, is the notion that it's not as
6 though projects in here aren't real; it's a question of what's the philosophy about how
7 would you fund it. And I think that's going to be something we're going to have to talk
8 about too. I think some are ready to go to construction sooner than others. There are
9 other assumptions we'll talk about in Montgomery College where given what we've
10 talked about with -- what we assume for funding from the state, for us to fund planning
11 and design makes sense, but not to include construction until later until we see what the
12 state wants to provide. I mean, I think there are some arguments for some different
13 approaches. It doesn't necessarily make it a more or less real project; it's just a different
14 strategy that gets us some capacity to be able to make sure we can fund a number of
15 projects. Councilmember Berliner.

16
17 Councilmember Berliner,

18 Thank you, Council President. Dr. Orlin, could you say again the issue with respect to
19 the Board of Education's estimate versus the County Executive's number, and what the
20 difference between that is, and the basis upon which one is chosen versus the other for
21 purposes of this exercise.

22
23 Glenn Orlin,

24 Sure. Typically, we track to the Executive's recommendation, the reason I mentioned
25 earlier, which is that his total recommendations are within spending affordability.
26 However, the problem this year, and this happened once before in the last
27 administration, is the Executive did not recommend specific projects in the MCPS CIP.
28 He basically says, I don't disagree with the MCPS CIP project by project, but I want to
29 see \$75 million cut out of it. And I want to see \$112 million cut out of it in the first four
30 years, and I'm going to go higher than the Board of Education by the difference, 40-
31 some million, in years '13 and '14. Because it's not project by project, that's the only
32 way we can track. Say the ED Committee makes a recommendation to delete addition
33 X, okay, which is the \$14 million. How would we track that against the Executive,
34 because he didn't make a recommendation for addition X. So we have to use the
35 Board's request as a starting point. And so it's built into these numbers. That doesn't
36 mean you have to accept the Board's request, it's just saying that's what we're tracking
37 to. So whatever you do in ED Committee and the Council when you review the ED
38 Committee's recommendations for MCPS -- this applies only to MCPS -- is that we'll
39 track changes as they are against the Board's request.

40
41 Councilmember Berliner,

42 And again, the difference between the two is \$75 million?

43
44 Glenn Orlin,



March 11, 2008

1 75 million over the six-year-period, but it's 112 million in the fiscal years '10 through '12.

2
3 Councilmember Berliner,

4 And the difference that you cited in the beginning of the conversation, that the gulf, if
5 you will, between where we are, where we need to be in order to get to reconciliation is
6 how big a figure?

7
8 Glenn Orlin,

9 About 200 million -- maybe 180 million.

10
11 Councilmember Berliner,

12 So we're \$180 million above that which you suggest historically is the figure that we can
13 get to a reconciliation process. And of that 180 million, 120 million is represented by the
14 difference between the Board of Education numbers and the County Executive's
15 numbers with respect to years '10, '11 and '12?

16
17 Glenn Orlin,

18 Well I'd say -- well mixing numbers here. If you look on page, it doesn't matter, 1 or 2. If
19 you add up the numbers for '10, '11 and '12 under final bonds, that's -- I'm doing it
20 quickly in my head -- 128, 234, about \$235 million is where we're at right now above
21 where we need to be.

22
23 Councilmember Berliner,

24 And again where we need to be is \$100 million above where we'll ultimately have to be;
25 is that what you're telling. Okay.

26
27 Glenn Orlin,

28 I'll characterize it is as -- maybe it's 112 million -- I'd say it's about half.

29
30 Councilmember Berliner,

31 That's all right, I'm just trying to orders of magnitude.

32
33 Glenn Orlin,

34 Where the issues are, and the rest are spread between Transportation, Culture and
35 Recreation, all the other areas.

36
37 Councilmember Berliner,

38 Thanks.

39
40 Glenn Orlin,

41 That makes sense, because the school system CIP is about half of the CIP. And again I
42 want to remind you that the Executive's recommendations actually reduced the -- in
43 nominal dollars the size of all the portions of the CIP with exception of Parks, which
44 went up 5%, but schools went up by 15% or 20%, in that range.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Berliner,
Schools went up by?

Glenn Orlin,
I believe it was 15% to 20%.

Councilmember Berliner,
Is that the Board of Education's number or is that the County Executive's numbers went up?

Glenn Orlin,
County Executive's number.

Councilmember Berliner,
Went up by -- .

Glenn Orlin,
The Board of Education is even higher.

Councilmember Berliner,
Was even higher. So the County Executive's number, even with his proposed reduction from the Board of Education figures is still -- represents a 15% to 20% increase over?

Glenn Orlin,
Let me go back and check that number. That number is in my head, but it's a double-digit number.

Councilmember Berliner,
Thank you.

President Knapp,
Councilmember Trachtenberg.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,
Thank you, President Knapp. Just to go back to the remarks made by my colleague Councilmember Elrich, I would just note for my colleagues that what I'm going to do is go through my copious paperwork on the rating trip that we took last year to New York, and provide some articles that I had the benefit of reading before I got up there. There's been a lot of extensive work done, published in particular, around the different parameters that are used for the rating exercises. And one thing I would note is in the three agencies that we visited last year, there were an assortment of questions, almost questions off a checklist. They were posed a little differently, but it was very clear that



March 11, 2008

1 they had very clear parameters that they expected us to adhere to. So I'll be happy to
2 provide that to colleagues.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 That would be good. Thank you. Councilmember Elrich.

6
7 Councilmember Elrich,
8 I just wanted to respond to -- I think you're very optimistic about how this will all work
9 out. And I'm a little bit less optimistic. And I think this CIP ought to have a clear direction
10 so that people have some certainty that what we do will get us -- will actually get done
11 within the six-year timeframe. I mean, my concern about counting on other people's
12 money, and what I really want to avoid is putting zeros in for construction. Because it's
13 not just the unreality of that, it's that we then launch design and planning on things we
14 then can't build. And then we've got ample experience now with the additional costs of
15 it; we might as well just burn the money if things aren't going to get built in a timely
16 manner. So I'd rather wait to initiate design and planning when there's a certainty we're
17 going to have the construction money. So I think we're going to have to make some
18 hard, hard choices and how to fit into this number. And I think we have to reserve the
19 temptation of being wildly optimistic about the out years just because we can. I think we
20 have to temper where we think we're going to be able to go.

21
22 President Knapp,
23 I agree with you completely, and I don't think it will be easy. I also recognize at the end
24 of this, we will have a balanced CIP and a balanced budget. So one way or another,
25 we're going to get these numbers to add up. Other comments? Councilmember Berliner.

26
27 Councilmember Berliner,
28 Just to follow-up to Mr. Orlin in light of the MFP Chair's observation; I assume that the
29 fiscal situation that we are currently entering into does bear some resemblance to the
30 fiscal situation that you referenced previously with respect to the times when we
31 exceeded the 10% limitation. Is that a fair characterization?

32
33 Glenn Orlin,
34 I think it's fair.

35
36 Councilmember Berliner,
37 [Inaudible] growing economy in good times, the 10% is not much of a problem, but in
38 lean times and recessionary times, there have been instances in which we have felt
39 compelled to go beyond that and still preserve our AAA bond rating; is that correct?

40
41 Glenn Orlin,
42 I think -- I'm not quite -- that's fairly -- I'd have to go back and check. I think it's probably
43 true, but let me go back and check that.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Berliner,

2 And let me just say to my colleague, Councilmember Elrich, with respect to your desire
3 to be real with respect to this budget, which is a desire that I share particularly with
4 respect to the rec centers. I would say however that the brief experience that I've had,
5 and we will have the conversation later this morning with respect to libraries for
6 example, I ask you to keep that in mind as an example of projects that we believe we
7 want to go forward, but about which there are many questions -- unanswered questions
8 that over the course of time we will have better information as to whether it is going to
9 be -- going here, going there, and when it's going. So if we want to send the "signal" that
10 we support these projects, we put the construction dollars, at the same time we really
11 don't know when these projects are going to unfold. So I think that we do need to be
12 discerning as to when we put the construction dollars in and when we don't based on
13 the particular circumstances.

14
15 President Knapp,

16 Thank you for your sobering overview. We appreciate it. And we will continue our
17 process.

18
19 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

20 And we will be calling you.

21
22 President Knapp,

23 Okay, our first agenda item this morning is in our CIP program is Montgomery College.
24 I'll let everybody get up to the table. Okay. I will turn to the President of the college.
25 Welcome Dr. Johnson, introduce the folks you've brought with you and any opening
26 remarks you may have.

27
28 Brian Johnson,

29 Good morning, President Knapp, members of the Council. Great to see you again. I'm
30 Brian Johnson, as you just stated, President of Montgomery College. I'm joined this
31 morning by Dr. Mary Kay Shartle-Galotto, our Executive Vice President for Academic
32 and Student Services, and Mr. David Capp, our Associate Vice President for Facilities.
33 In our testimony before the Council on February 5, and in testimony before the
34 Education Committee on February 21, we presented the rationale for our fiscal year '09
35 capital budget request. We spoke primarily of three things; our capacity issues, deferred
36 maintenance needs, and the renovations necessary for the reprogramming of buildings.
37 Above all, we spoke about our faith with the residents of this great county. We spoke of
38 the need to ensure access to higher education and the need that this access remains a
39 reality for every county resident. The evidence to us suggests that you not only heard
40 us, but you understood very well, and for that we are grateful. We are especially grateful
41 for the Education Committee and we are pleased with the recommendations that are
42 now before the Council. While we certainly want to be respectful of your time, I would
43 like to just take a second to remind you of a few details of Montgomery College's
44 enrollments and credit courses now stands at 24,000 students; we have 60,000



March 11, 2008

1 students combined credit or non-credit in our environment per semester. Our smallest
2 campus serves more students than one-half of the comprehensive community colleges
3 in the state of Maryland. Our fall enrollment we're up 5.2% over last year at this time,
4 and at our Takoma Park Silver Spring campus we've had two successive sessions
5 semesters in which our enrollment surged by 10%. We're very grateful for your support
6 in years past. We're hopeful that you'll continue this level of support. We're hopeful that
7 you'll continue to act in a way that helps us to assure access and affordable, high-
8 quality education for our post-secondary environment. And we certainly appreciate all
9 that you have done.

10
11 President Knapp,

12 Thank you very much. Before we get started, I know that Councilmember Ervin, who is
13 absent at other Council today that the Education Committee took this up wanted to
14 affirm that she was also supportive of the committee's recommendations; is that
15 accurate?

16
17 Councilmember Ervin,

18 Yes, that's accurate, thank you very much. And I also wanted to just make a comment
19 or two. I really appreciate the hard work of the college and its staff, and am very happy
20 to vote in the affirmative to support your recommendation to the CIP. However, while I
21 have the floor, I would like to also state my disappointment at the college's decision to
22 fight the unionization effort going on among your adjunct faculty. And I think that that's
23 very troubling, because if you're fighting the union using public tax dollars, I think that
24 would be very inappropriate and unfortunate. So hopefully at some point throughout this
25 unionizing effort you will have an opportunity to sit down and work with your adjunct
26 faculty and with the SEIU to come to some resolution on this issue.

27
28 President Knapp,

29 Councilmember Leventhal.

30
31 Councilmember Leventhal,

32 Well, yeah, I want to associate myself with Councilmember Ervin's comments. I
33 certainly support the committee's work and support the good work of Montgomery
34 College, and little by little we're making progress on a wide range of facility needs that
35 have been crying out for attention for a long time. And I enjoy working with President
36 Johnson; he's done a very good job of establishing relationships with us here and
37 throughout the community. I see him everywhere. However, on the last Council, the
38 Council President -- our current Council President, Mr. Knapp, was the sponsor of
39 legislation that stated that no contractor with the County could expend County dollars
40 either to promote or to fight a unionization effort. I haven't had a chance -- this was just
41 brought to my attention yesterday, so I haven't had a chance to look up that statute and
42 determine how and whether it would affect Montgomery College. I think the sponsor's
43 intent, Mr. Knapp, a few years ago had to do more with outside non-profits, but it does
44 effect 501C3 institutions and it may indeed today be applicable to Montgomery College.



March 11, 2008

1 I need to look it up. But I just want to associate myself with Councilmember Ervin's
2 concern. I would not want to see public funds spent for consulting on how to fight a
3 unionization effort. I would not want to see County funds spent as the bill that we voted
4 for on the last Council stated in any way to become a partisan for or against a
5 unionization effort. The dialogue over unionization ought to be -- ought to take place in a
6 manner that is free of coercion, free of pressure, and certainly should not involve the
7 expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

8
9 President Knapp,
10 Councilmember Berliner.

11
12 Councilmember Berliner,
13 Dr. Johnson, I just want to commend you for your work and the work of this college,
14 which I think all of us appreciate, is going to take on increased importance in our
15 community. The demographics are only suggested as much and the roles of community
16 colleges throughout the country are increasing, and to have a premiere community
17 college in our midst is a matter of some pride for our community. And I fully support your
18 desire to become literally one of the best in the country. And I believe you're on the way
19 to do that. I was shocked when I heard recently that we are now turning people away, or
20 at least is was my understanding was that you are no longer in a position to accept all
21 who knock on your door. I don't sit on the Education Committee. So if the Council
22 President will forgive, I would appreciate hearing from you with respect to that issue,
23 because I think it does go to some of the capacity constraints that you currently face,
24 and hopefully that this budget will begin to alleviate. But I do find it troubling that this
25 institution is now constrained in such a manner. I've got a boy that I'm hoping will be
26 knocking on your door, and I certainly want to make sure that there's room for him if
27 that's where he decides to go. So if you could speak to it.

28
29 President Knapp,
30 And unfortunately that's been the case for a few years, and we've been working to try to
31 rectify that. But I would turn to Dr. Johnson to clarify that even further.

32
33 Brian Johnson,
34 Thank you for that invitation to respond. I'd start first by recognizing the comments from
35 Councilmember Ervin and Councilmember Leventhal, and let you know that we hear
36 your concern, and we will take your counsel under advisement. And we appreciate the
37 candid remarks. Councilmember Berliner, we have in recent years, as President Knapp
38 has indicated, turned away students for a number of reasons. The most obvious reason
39 for us is space and capacity and ability. The support of this Council has given us the
40 opportunity to leverage more courses and to make more course work available. And our
41 Executive Vice President Mary Shartle-Galotto will address that in a minute. Another
42 reason that we turned away students has to do with financial need. We have students
43 that simply can't afford the very low tuitions of a community college experience. So we
44 have a dual sort of front that we're fighting on. One is students who can't afford to pay.



March 11, 2008

1 And the other is we simply don't have the space ability. Our plans for this health
2 sciences center at the Rockville campus, which we hope to open in a couple of years,
3 would afford us something like 59 labs and 106 classrooms. So it's a way to respond
4 and to fulfill the work force pipeline that's being created by this vast need for bio-
5 technicians and folks in the bioscience industry. With your permission I'd ask Mary
6 Shartle-Galotto if she would want to add comments.

7
8 Mary Shartle-Galotto,

9 Well, as Dr. Johnson said, the major reason that we turn students away is because they
10 can't afford it, and because we use the maximum financial aid that we have available for
11 them, not only the federal financial aid, but additional funds, grant funds that we make
12 available for students. But, of course, we're also -- we are just pushed to the max with
13 capacity issues even at our Takoma Park campus -- Takoma Park Silver Spring, excuse
14 me. Even though we've done great expansion there, and as you hear our enrollment is
15 surging, we are pressed because the nursing program which we have expand greatly is
16 also pressed. And so now we're trying to move our continuing Ed folks out of the health
17 sciences center into additional space in Cafritz so we can continue to expand the
18 nursing program. Right now we are constrained because we can't hire more faculty,
19 because we have no office space for them. And we are required by statute to have each
20 faculty member needs an office. We can't even double them up. Yes. They need space
21 not only for office but to be able to confer with students. And so that's one of the issues
22 that we're facing right now that we have -- if we're going to expand our faculty, we have
23 to have office space. And we're very constrained by that. Rockville, as you know, we've
24 been talking about the sciences and how they're expanding, and we're going to have
25 our health or our science center, thank goodness. But we still have real demands for
26 space. And we are currently talking to Shady Grove about bringing some of our lecture
27 classes in English and psychology and our general education courses up to Shady
28 Grove, so that we can temporarily at least find some relief from that. And then, of
29 course, at Germantown, the Goldenrod Building when that opens that's going to relieve
30 some of the space. But at each of the campuses there are unique instances where we
31 are constrained for space. So we thank you for your support. And as Dr. Johnson
32 said, there are many reasons, the greatest of them is financial aid. But there are also
33 individual issues at each of our campuses about space.

34
35 President Knapp,

36 I would also just point to my colleagues on circle five, where it talks about the space
37 needs at Montgomery College. And it shows fall of 2006 the deficit of 134,000 square
38 feet at Germantown, 256,000 square feet in Rockville, and 117,000 square feet at
39 Takoma Park. If you look at if we actually funded the major requests put forward by the
40 college, we and the state, you can see that we still -- the deficit actually increases still in
41 Germantown, goes down slightly in Rockville, and goes down slightly in Takoma Park.
42 That's if we fund the projects that are scheduled to be funded. And so you can begin to
43 get a sense of kind of where we are just to look at that in its context. So you're looking
44 at nearly -- well let's see we're not quite -- not quite half-million square feet of space that



March 11, 2008

1 they're down right now. And even if we fund what they're asking for, we're still almost
2 250,000 square feet down. Just for context for folks. Councilmember Vice President
3 Andrews.

4
5 Vice President Andrews,

6 Thank you, President Knapp. Well, we have one of the premiere community colleges in
7 the nation, and that is one of the reasons it's recognized well by many students. And it's
8 one of the reasons that we're seeing so much demand for the college. I think if there's
9 was a picture next to the phrase bursting at the seams in the dictionary, it would be a
10 picture of Montgomery College next to it, given the demand that there exists compared
11 to the amount of space that is currently available. And if we're going to maintain truly the
12 policy of open admissions, which is effected both by cost and available space in the
13 desired programs that students be part of, then we need to continue to find a way to
14 help the college keep up with that demand. The demand is only likely to increase as the
15 cost of four-year colleges continues -- if it continues to increase faster than the rate of
16 inflation, as it has for the last 20 years or 30 years. So the college plays an absolutely
17 crucial role in helping so many young people in this County and some not so young
18 people achieve their dreams and afford college. And it's a tremendous mission that you
19 have, and the amount of good that comes out of the college is enormous, and the
20 contribution to our County is hard to quantify. So this is a really important aspect of what
21 the County Council does is to continue to help the college be available to so many
22 people.

23
24 President Knapp,
25 Councilmember Elrich.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,

28 Montgomery College has come a long way from when I was a kid when we didn't
29 consider it as a serious place to go. We wanted to go to a university. And today it's a
30 very serious place to go. And it's not just the expense of the regular colleges, which
31 make it important, but I think it provides essential skill education which kids are not
32 leaving high school with. I think we've had a lot of discussion about that the only
33 children that leave public schools prepared are really the students that are going to go
34 on to a four-year college, and you know, and beyond. And that if you leave and you're
35 not prepared to do that, you leave high school without required skills really to enter the
36 workforce, and Montgomery College is playing an increasing role in providing that. And
37 I've heard the phrase K-14 education. And I think we need to really begin to think
38 seamlessly about how Montgomery College fits as part of the normal education stream
39 in Montgomery County. Almost an expectation that for the larger number of students
40 who aren't going to go on to the University of Maryland or one of the other universities in
41 the system, that Montgomery College is the natural place to spend years 13 and 14 to
42 get the skills and the base they need. So I really think that addressing the deficits in
43 space is really critical. And I really appreciate the work you do. I will also say that I want
44 you to be clear that I would also associate myself with the comments made by George



March 11, 2008

1 and Valerie regarding the unionization issue. And I really do hope that you'd take our
2 views on this into consideration. I had a question about the capital budget, because of
3 the fact there's not construction money in for some of these things. What is -- what are
4 you realistically going to plan, and what would you realistically -- could you build in the
5 next six years if -- considering -- could you go -- could you go through planning, design
6 and construction? Or are these projects, you know, are they really not going to be ready
7 in the six-year timeframe?
8

9 David Capp,

10 Sir, David Capp, the Facilities Director. You know that the Rockville science building is
11 on the CIP, and it is, oh boy, we're at 50% CD, so definitely can start building that one.
12 In fact, we're looking to bid it this summer. Germantown bioscience, the design team is
13 on board and they just finished schematic drawings -- just showed up in the office. If we
14 get the design money to finish it this year, we could start construction next fiscal year.
15 And then as we worked with the Ed Committee, there are a number of other projects
16 that are in various phases, and it just really depends on -- and I heard the discussion
17 with Dr. Orlin beforehand, you know, where you show your construction money versus
18 your design money, and I think that's an issue to really discuss further. But could be
19 conceivably build everything we possibly need to fit and meet the space deficits,
20 probably not. Now you just can't have two major construction projects per campus going
21 on simultaneously. I think that would just disrupt the campus so much. But right now the
22 way it's laid out is we essentially get one building on each campus going, which we can
23 manage and can handle. So we get, you know, the work we've done at Takoma Park
24 Silver Spring campus -- and that's been some disruption there, but it's successful. So
25 now we're moving to Rockville after that Germantown, and then we're going to go back
26 to Rockville to finish the science buildings that are existing renovation, student service
27 center. And then Germantown and then back down to Takoma. So I think we phased it
28 so that we can manage the construction projects in terms of disruption to the campus
29 and in terms of our ability to manage it. It really will be a fiscal issue.
30

31 Councilmember Elrich,

32 I guess I'm wondering is this where you normally might pull from the GO bond reserve?
33 Are these the kind of projects that would pop up and then come out of the reserve, were
34 they to pop up? Or are these things we ought to be considering seriously within the six-
35 year CIP?
36

37 President Knapp,

38 Well, let's walk through -- let me get back -- we can answer some of that I think if we
39 walk through it. And I have some specific questions as it relates to each of the specific
40 projects. But I think that's a good question, and I think that's the dialogue we need to
41 have here today. So we can walk through some of these assumptions that the
42 committee had, which I think are certainly up for debate within the Council.
43 Councilmember Floreen.
44



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,

2 Thank you. I have those same questions. But I just wanted to say an introductory
3 comment; I think the success at the college is critical to the success of Montgomery
4 County. I think we've moved past MCPS. I think a successful community college is --
5 creates an environment both for residents who advanced training of one sort or another,
6 and for employers who need skilled workers with a focus on actually being skilled for a
7 job that we need to economy forward. And I think we owe a tremendous debt of
8 gratitude to you all for your hard work in creating an environment that is welcoming and
9 that is creating a whole generation of workers with creative approaches to problem-
10 solving. I know you have a tremendous track record of sending people on to four-year
11 programs across the country, but you also have a very successful program of focus
12 professional training in a huge variety of initiatives, and the nursing program is just one
13 little piece. I know you have the Macklin Institute. You have training programs for critical
14 needs. And I think that sends a statement to employers, to businesses, to nonprofits, to
15 our hospitals, to everyone who is trying to provide service to current residents, much
16 less future residents, that there is a resource that they can look to and partner with for
17 moving forward. So I agree that we need to have a serious conversation about how we
18 get you properly positioned to move forward. And I know that everyone has a plan for
19 you to share some property with them so they can do work with you on things. I know
20 that's floating out there. But I think we as a county need to recognize and commend you
21 for your absolutely critical contribution to the ability of the County to advance itself and
22 its current population. So all these projects are really, really very important, and I think I
23 would like to hear from you all as to the theory about our relationship with state aid on
24 these initiatives, and how we work this through. It's an important conversation, I think,
25 given the conversation we just had previously about approaches to the capital reserve
26 and negotiating with the other players in terms of resources. So with that I will look
27 forward to the committee chair's presentation on this subject. But I think it cannot be
28 overstated how important the college is, I think, to the economic future of Montgomery
29 County. And hopefully we'll get ourselves in a position where we can talk about what
30 are the real needs within the County for younger students, older students, retooling
31 themselves, and for businesses and employers generally, so we can make sure that
32 we're helping you as best we can.

33
34 President Knapp,
35 Council Vice President Andrews.

36
37 Vice President Andrews,
38 As Councilmember Floreen noted, state aid is critical, and I think the strategy is clearly
39 now to ask for bricks and mortar rather than -- and to focus on the big items and the
40 projects that are ready to go in one year. And we had discussion about that in
41 committee. I've always been struck by the number of Montgomery County high school
42 graduates who go through the college. What's the latest number that you have on the
43 numbers of the percentage of Montgomery County high school students that will go
44 through the college?



March 11, 2008

1
2 Mary Shartle-Galotto,
3 About 25%.

4
5 President Knapp,
6 [Inaudible].

7
8 Mary Shartle-Galotto,
9 About 25% of the graduating class, about a quarter -- a little more than that in recent
10 times. But we are working on increasing that number, because that -- whereas those
11 students used to just show up, now we work for them and we really are trying to get to
12 populations that don't generally think of college as a next step. And so we're continuing
13 to work on that to support the number that we already have and to increase that
14 number.

15
16 Vice President Andrews,
17 I would imagine then that of the colleges where high school graduates go, you're
18 number one.

19
20 Mary Shartle-Galotto,
21 Oh, in Maryland, certainly.

22
23 Vice President Andrews,
24 Of our system. Thank you.

25
26 Brian Johnson,
27 Vice President Andrews, if I could add just a broader context of that number. It's 25% of
28 the immediate high school graduates, 60% of graduates from MCPS end up within our
29 universe. So it's 25% immediately -- .

30
31 Vice President Andrews,
32 First year, 60% eventually.

33
34 Brian Johnson,
35 We serve 60% of the graduates over a period of time. And we certainly get more than
36 our share of reverse transfers -- students that began at the university and then return
37 back to us.

38
39 Vice President Andrews,
40 That is very striking and notable. Thank you.

41
42 President Knapp,
43 Council member Berliner.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Berliner,

Last comment. I just want to share with my colleagues, again, as if father of a teenager who is beginning to explore these options. The fact that I thought was most striking about Montgomery College was that for students who go there for two years and then transfer into the University of Maryland that they perform better than kids who just go straight into the University of Maryland. So that the last two years of kids coming out of Montgomery College are better at University of Maryland than those who are there for the entire time. So these folks really prepare people, so I commend you for that good work.

President Knapp,

Councilmember Elrich. You guys are popular.

Councilmember Elrich,

Just out of curiosity. The 60% of the MCPS students that go to Montgomery College, how many require math and reading remediation? What percentages are you dealing with?

Mary Shartle-Galotto,

Well, I can talk about incoming students right out of the graduating class. It nears the national average is for students who need developmental education, so it's about 40% of the students need reading or English remediation, and a little higher for math -- about 60%.

Councilmember Elrich,

A little higher.

Mary Shartle-Galotto,

Yeah. But there are whole levels of remediation too. Some people just need a quick course to prepare for the college-level math; some need two and three developmental classes before they're ready.

Councilmember Elrich,

Of the students who enter, who many graduate?

Mary Shartle-Galotto,

Of the students who enter -- .

Councilmember Elrich,

Of the ones who start there, how many finish?

Mary Shartle-Galotto,



March 11, 2008

1 Well, we don't -- we really talk in terms of a cohort. And I'd have to get you the figures
2 for that. I don't really have that. But usually we talk about a four-year cohort of students
3 and how many transfer and how many graduate.

4
5 Councilmember Elrich,
6 Thank you.

7
8 President Knapp,
9 Councilmember Floreen.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 I want to thank Councilmember Elrich for bringing up the remediation issue. How are we
13 doing with MCPS in resolving this issue? I think this was brought to our attention a year
14 and half ago or so where we didn't -- hadn't fully appreciated the issues. And I know that
15 there are views on the subject. But how are we doing in terms of who -- in terms of
16 MCPS properly preparing these kids for our local community college? Not even going to
17 other efforts. Part of this conversation proceedings, Mr. Johnson.

18
19 President Knapp,
20 Yes, they are.

21
22 Brian Johnson,
23 I'm very encouraged by the level of conversations that Montgomery College and
24 Montgomery County Public School system has engaged in. We -- I certainly myself
25 have regular and routine meetings with Dr. Weast that I think moving forward in a way
26 that this Council would be proud of. We're having really tough nuts and bolts
27 conversations about things like academic achievement. We see from the progress being
28 made at MCPS that there is the closing, for example, of the achievement gap that exists
29 in the younger grades of students based on race and other criteria. And that's
30 encouraging to us because we're hoping to receive those students down the line. We
31 have already scheduled for the month of April a joint board meeting where our board at
32 the college will meet with the board at MCPS to discuss long-range joint planning. We
33 found some disconnects in the students that have moved from MCPS to Montgomery
34 College and those are the areas that we want to talk about. If, for example, we see that
35 students that take our English placement test are doing well in breaking up sentences,
36 sentence diagramming and not as well in literature, then we have to ask the question
37 what's happening in their senior year, and is it matching what we expect them to come
38 to us prepared for. So there some gap in what's happening in the senior year for those
39 students.

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,
42 It does seem to be an issue. Well, I'm sure we will take this up as we get to the MCPS
43 conversation. I hope it will be.



March 11, 2008

1 President Knapp,
2 At least the MCPS operating budget.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Yes.

6
7 Brian Johnson,
8 But we'll definitely say that we feel confident that the conversations are moving forward
9 in an admirable way.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 But your percentages raise some serious questions about how our county kids are
13 being prepared. However, they are the ones you see, and I would like to think that the
14 tests that you employ to ferret out this information are relevant to all our kids, all our
15 children within the MCPS environment. So, I think this it is incumbent upon us to
16 continue to make this a big priority. As it obviously is. Thanks.

17
18 Mary Shartle-Galotto,
19 If I could just add, as you know, when we started this partnership years ago, that was
20 the exact issue that it was designed to address; the gap and the preparation of
21 students. We've done a good job I think over the years. What's happened though the
22 percentages haven't changed that much because our population has really changed.
23 But what has changed is that we have a very strong partnership with MCPS now, and at
24 all different levels we are working to address this. High school principals come to us and
25 set up individual programs so that they can access their students early so the gap is --
26 they can address that while the students are still in high school. We're working on
27 putting together some two-plus-two programs so that we can address students in high
28 school and really get them ready. We talked -- Frieda Lacy and Stu Edelstein and I talk
29 about this process. And we talk about the Montgomery College pulling the students into
30 post secondary education and MCPS pushing them. And I think that's what we need to
31 do together. We need to get students aware and ready when they're still in high school
32 to know that they need to go forward. And as I said, the partnership really encourages
33 me. There are so many different ways that we're addressing this. So I think you for your
34 support of it.

35
36 President Knapp,
37 I commend Mary Shartle-Galotto and Dr. Johnson for their [inaudible] conversation that
38 I know has been brought to the Council, but on conversations I've had with both of
39 them, and encouraging MCPS as well. And they've really taken this and have been
40 working very hard over the last six to eight months to forge that relationship to make
41 sure that we're addressing this issue. So I thank each of you for your efforts in that
42 respect. Councilmember Ervin.

43
44 Councilmember Ervin,



March 11, 2008

1 Hopefully, I'm the final comment on this, but what gave rise to a lot of this conversation
2 happened yesterday when the PHED Committee and the ED Committee had a joint
3 meeting on after-school programs. But what really touched it off was a conversation
4 about how many of our high school students are academically ineligible; like 50% at
5 some schools. And so for me it's a very serious issue because we don't really hear the
6 truth about this gap; we just hear good news. We never hear any bad news. And the
7 bad news is that when the children that are graduating -- you can graduate with a lower
8 than 2.0 GPA. They come into your system and they're woefully inadequately prepared
9 because they've been failing school for four years. And so, you know, sitting on this side
10 of dais, you know, we have to make some very serious decisions and some calls on
11 how we spend the taxpayers' money and we have a situation whereby we just hear how
12 great our school system is, but we know. You know, we know what happens when the
13 kids show up at your front door. And so I think that the conversation we had yesterday
14 was a really good one in terms of really isolating the problem and talking about it. And
15 not shoving it under the rug saying our gap is closing among four and five and six-year-
16 olds when thousands and thousands and thousands of children are not being well
17 served. So I will end it there, but that's what the conversation was about.

18
19 President Knapp,

20 Thank you, Councilmember Ervin. Okay, now back to the Capital Budget. What you
21 have before you in the packet are the committee's recommendations. Chuck has laid
22 them out in those things that we've approved as requested, and if we can walk through
23 those very quickly. Probably the most significant of those is the Rockville Science
24 Center, which was included in the Governor's Capital Budget for funding. And so we are
25 very pleased at that. It's a significant step above the million dollars we got from the state
26 last year. So we have \$29 million assuming that the legislature approves the Governor's
27 budget in that respect go to the Rockville Science Center which was the college's top
28 priority for capital projects. And so we're all very pleased with that. The other issues
29 primarily are infrastructure maintenance types of issues where we had an extensive
30 conversation on -- as the case with many. We love to be doing more, but I think the
31 resources that we're putting here and have been requested by the college are sufficient
32 to keep all of these programs and projects on track to make sure that they're operational
33 for the successful education of our students at the Montgomery College campuses.
34 Councilmember Floreen.

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 Is that your presentation?

38
39 President Knapp,

40 Well, only on that piece, I was going more you had a question I'm assuming on one of
41 these pieces.

42
43 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 My question is this, how much of the capital budget here is -- apparently, the decision
2 was made only to include the design money.

3
4 President Knapp,

5 I hadn't gotten to that. That's the next step. I just did projects that were approved if
6 people had any questions as it relates to those. I see none. Okay. Now once we get to
7 projects that have not yet been designed; and this is consistent with the conversation
8 that the Council has had, or it continues to have. What we tried to work out with the
9 college was the best approach, recognizing that as the Council Vice President
10 indicated, we want to make sure that we are in the best position to take advantage of
11 state dollars. And so what we wanted to do was to make sure that we had projects that
12 were fully planned and designed so that they were ready to move forward. For example,
13 the next top priority for the college is the bioscience education center for Germantown
14 campus. And what we wanted to do was to -- that will likely come up we'd like to think in
15 next year's capital budget. And that's our goal to make sure that that's effectively
16 planned in design. But we don't know if that will come up and what the state will -- how
17 that will proceed with the state, so we wanted to make sure we're in a position to
18 advocate for the most amount of money and then see how that works from the state
19 perspective to make sure that we get the bricks and mortars. And not use state dollars
20 for planning and design, because we figured we could actually fund that piece, so we
21 can make sure we get as much money as we possibly can. And that was the approach
22 that we've taken for many of these to make sure that we have them planned and
23 designed so we can begin to work down the college's priority list. I would -- Dr. Johnson,
24 if you would just kind of explain kind of how the community colleges throughout the
25 state have structured the capital list for all of the state's community college capital
26 requests so we the Council has an understanding of how we proceeded off that list this
27 year, and how we hope to proceed in the coming years.

28
29 Brian Johnson,

30 President Knapp, the 16 community colleges in the state of Maryland gather under the
31 umbrella of an organization called MACC -- the Maryland Association of Community
32 Colleges. This last year we had the task given to us by the Hogan Commission, the then
33 Hogan Commission, to look at a \$60 million allocation and decide how we would spend
34 that amongst the 16 or 15 community colleges; Baltimore City being excluded. We went
35 through a series of processes to get us to a model that we could all live with. And we
36 took into consideration colleges that had designs that were strictly academic; colleges
37 that had designs that were in some ways recreational, like physical fitness centers and
38 so on. We talked about the ages of the existing facilities. We looked at the historical
39 trend of when particular colleges received their last allocations. It was a major matrices
40 of variables. To our great delight, of the \$60 million, Montgomery College was agreed to
41 as the school that should have received \$30 million of the 60 based on our need and
42 our promotion of our Rockville campus health sciences center. That's in the queue and
43 the County has been great at, as far as we know, saying there is still a set aside for the
44 County match for that. That's general what that formula has been. And, in my view, it



March 11, 2008

1 was a one-time formula because we haven't been guided to provide that to the state
2 again.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 Okay. Councilmember Floreen.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,
8 Well my question about all these capital projects, are they all fundamentally the
9 obligation of the state?

10
11 David Capp,
12 When you say all, ma'am.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Well, the big ticket items.

16
17 David Capp,
18 The big ticket items generally are. The state will not fund small renovations. But they
19 won't -- well I can't say that because a roof replacement they would fund, partially, 50%.

20
21 Councilmember Floreen,
22 Is that set by state law?

23
24 David Capp,
25 Let me ask one question.

26
27 John McLean,
28 I'm John McLean.

29
30 President Knapp,
31 John, come on up.

32
33 John McLean,
34 John McLean, Director of Planning and Design for the college. What the state looks at is
35 infrastructure support in new projects there -- and major renovations would fall under
36 that. So they will fund a whole range of projects, as Dave was starting to say. It could be
37 as small as a \$100,000 roof replacement project. There's normally a cap, or a minimum
38 of \$100,000 projects that they are looking at, all the way up to major new construction,
39 in our case, the Rockville Science Center for \$60 million.

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,
42 Sure, so this is part of the State's basic higher education charter?

43
44 John McLean,



March 11, 2008

1 Correct.

2
3 Councilmember Floreen,
4 So, it is their baliwick and what we do is then is supplement what is technically a state
5 obligation.

6
7 John McLean,
8 Right, for Montgomery County the share rate is 50%. For some of the smaller counties
9 it's as high as 70% and so -- .

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 And that's set by statute?

13
14 John McLean,
15 Correct.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 Statute or regulation?

19
20 John McLean,
21 Regulation, I guess.

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Okay. So that establishes the fiscal relationship as no doubt a goal.

25
26 David Capp,
27 I think we should also clarify, the state does not fund deferred maintenance type
28 projects. They see that as the county's responsibility.

29
30 Councilmember Floreen,
31 Sure.

32
33 David Capp,
34 So if it's a major renovation construction programmatic change of an entire building,
35 something like that, yes. Where I was getting confused is there are some cases where
36 they would fund an entire infrastructure replacement if it was a system-wide approach,
37 such as roofs. They have traditionally funded that. And to go back where Mr. Knapp was
38 going; as long as this prioritization model is in place, which was capped at \$61 million
39 and you heard Dr. Johnson talk about, that we had to prioritize -- all 16 presidents had
40 to prioritize all their projects. Well it became an issue for us, personally, why go to the
41 State for a \$200,000 roof replacement if that had to count as priority one, when in fact,
42 we have a \$29 million science building construction project that's ready to go, and make
43 that a priority two; so that didn't make sense. So it's all wound together -- or woven
44 together, I guess I should say.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Floreen,
Sure okay.

President Knapp,
Which is basically how the committee tried to look at this, is let's make sure we're in a position to go forward on the biggest ticket item.

Councilmember Floreen,
The most important.

President Knapp,
Exactly. The other piece I think is important to clarify, and correct me if I'm wrong. But unlike school construction, we don't generally get -- if we forward-fund projects, we don't generally get reimbursed for community college projects the same way we would with school construction.

David Capp,
Correct. The county appropriates all the funding authority first and then we march forward and do the construction, and then we turn in documents to the state, certificates of project completion. And then the state reimburses or determines what is eligible for their match, and then provides the matching funds as the project progresses.

Councilmember Floreen,
So, when do you know, in terms of how the state looks at funding of these projects? Is it an annual competition?

David Capp,
Yes, ma'am. And I think we'll talk a little bit about history here.

Councilmember Floreen,
Sure.

David Capp,
When I first got here 8 years ago, I think the capital budget -- and John has been here 26 years, so we can go back further. But I think the capital budget bond bill, which is an annual submission to the State -- it's a bond bill and it goes to the Maryland Higher Education Commission. That dollar amount for all community colleges was in the \$40 million range when I got here. It was at \$20 million prior to that very short prior to that. So we've been at \$40 million statewide for all 16 community colleges. And based upon what community college you are, that amount of money you got from the state might be 50% match, which it is for this county. And then for other counties that don't have the finances it could be 60% state funds, 40% or 65/35. Anyhow, now it's up to \$60 million the past year, and the Governor has recommended this year \$81 million for this.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Floreen,
3 But you don't know from year to year what's going to be included in that.

4
5 David Capp,
6 No, ma'am.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 And so you need projects designed and ready to go to be able to compete for that
10 resource.

11
12 David Capp,
13 Well again back to the story of the prioritization project. The state would and has
14 participated in the actual designing. John is required to turn in program documents
15 about that thick to defend and justify the project. So the state would provide 50% of the
16 funding for design, and then the project two years later could ask for construction. As
17 Mr. Knapp is saying, why go up for a \$3 million worth of design when you can go up for
18 \$30 million worth of construction money.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 If it helps right. Well that's the strategy.

22
23 David Capp,
24 Yes.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,
27 I defer to the experts on that. Okay, well that's helpful. I'm trying to understand.
28 Obviously we have a couple of areas where we are negotiating with the State on
29 various approaches. At least yours is relatively -- there's actually sort of a path to
30 success, as opposed to other areas. So, okay. Well that's helpful. Thank you.

31
32 President Knapp,
33 And so the buy -- .

34
35 Councilmember Floreen,
36 It explains why this is they way [inaudible].

37
38 President Knapp,
39 Correct. That is. That would explain it. The one, I think, question that is probably up for
40 debate relative to the way the Council has approved projects last week in their
41 discussion is the bioscience education center. What we included for the bioscience
42 education center was funding for design with the expectation that that would be
43 submitted as the next project. Not knowing what the actual construction cost would be
44 or not knowing how the State would proceed as far as the general plan for how they



March 11, 2008

1 would look at the capital projects next year. We did not put the construction dollars in.
2 One could argue that we could put the construction dollars in as a placeholder and kind
3 of keep rolling that until such as the State actually came through. The committee chose
4 to put the planning and design in and we'll get a better sense of where we thought
5 things were going from a state level and make the appropriate modifications as we
6 needed to. To Mr. Elrich's question looking at kind of the reserve fund as something to
7 be able to utilize in that capacity. And so that's a policy question that is there for the
8 Council. Other new projects -- oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Elrich.

9
10 Councilmember Elrich,

11 I'm looking at this same list on page two, and I guess I'm trying to get my hand around
12 how many of these would realistically be funded by the State in a six-year time period,
13 and how many of them do we really need. And if the state funded you're saying a 50%
14 match, then how much do we need to put aside to cover the other half of the 50%. I'm
15 trying to understand how this sequentially would play out. What would you get? What
16 would we need? And then the Council -- if we really think we need this and it is not
17 going to come from the State, do we do it internally or do we not do it all?

18
19 President Knapp,

20 Well, I think the one question would be -- or the one answer is we've tried to lay these
21 out so we could be in a position to take advantage of it. I guess the question is what will
22 the State do and when will the State do it. Last year we got \$1 million for a project in
23 Takoma Park. So obviously that's not going to go a long way towards much of anything.
24 This year we are on the list for \$29 million, which is significant. Next year does it go
25 back to a million-dollar project? If it does then that's not going to go a long way towards
26 construction of the bioscience education center. If however we end up looking at like the
27 same types of funding level that we did this year, we'll be in position to put in a request
28 for that because we'll know what the actual construction costs will be, and we can make
29 the appropriate modification. The next priority is -- well, you actually had the health
30 sciences expansion was next on the list. But that was only 5.35 million. And to your
31 point what the committee was recommending was that we actually for the 5.35, since it
32 actually gets real capacity for a real workforce development programs right now, that we
33 actually program the capacity for us to do that construction. Not necessarily submit that
34 to the State, so we can actually get that done. And then the next projects would be the
35 science east renovation and then science west renovation, as the next priorities that we
36 would have planned and designed and ready to submit to the State, depending upon
37 what their cycle would be. So practically I think in the next six years you would have
38 bioscience education center, then the Council doing or the County funding the health
39 sciences expansion WDCE, and then moving into science east and science west in,
40 ideally, years three and four of the CIP if everything goes the right way.

41
42 Councilmember Elrich,

43 And that will require -- all of those projects require some money from us?
44



March 11, 2008

1 President Knapp,
2 At some point, yes.

3
4 Councilmember Elrich,
5 Theoretically years three and four in the CIP.

6
7 President Knapp,
8 If the State comes through.

9
10 Charles Sherer,
11 And the County would fund all of the design [inaudible] design was requested. Several
12 projects we're requesting design FY09. So the County would fund all of that with bonds.

13
14 President Knapp,
15 So, what you see here are the committee's recommendation was to set all of these
16 forward for design so we're ready to proceed depending upon where the state was
17 going with the exception of number four, which was the health sciences expansion,
18 because we figured with that type of amount we could actually fund that, actually have
19 real capacity on the ground, and it wouldn't take out of a much larger project.

20
21 Councilmember Elrich,
22 I guess this begs the question about whether we ought to have money in those years to
23 do our half of these projects if we think we're going to design them and the State is
24 going to give us money, shouldn't we account for it? Or should we make assumptions
25 about our reserves that they're not going to, you know, Glenn's point about your
26 reserves aren't enough to cover what you need. If we're going to say that we're going to
27 not put it in the regular CIP but of course the reserves are there, then his assumptions
28 about what's in the reserves for everything else has to be diminished accordingly.

29
30 President Knapp,
31 Right. And that was kind of the -- that was where the committee was going was
32 assuming the reserve, and that way you have a necessarily program there's dollars if
33 the State doesn't come through, because if we forward fund those projects, we don't get
34 reimbursed for any of that money from the state. So we figured we will do this as a
35 partnership and if it's there we've got the reserve to address it. Which is how we
36 approached these projects under number two. Councilmember Floreen?

37
38 Councilmember Floreen,
39 How are the health services expansion dollars shown -- they are not shown in the
40 reconciliation list of it seems that Glenn just took us through.

41
42 President Knapp,
43 That's one of the questions actually for Chuck.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,

2 I appreciate that because the State is funding the bioscience center that is actually a
3 subtraction from the County's expected exposure on that. So that gets you looking
4 good. Congratulations in the math. But I did wonder, I don't see this particular element.
5 It's not in here?

6
7 President Knapp,

8 It doesn't show. And I'm sorry, but that was my question for Chuck, because I thought
9 we'd actually said to go ahead and program the 5.35 for the health sciences center -- for
10 the -- .

11
12 Charles Sherer,

13 What I showed in the report was just the design. You did have a discussion about
14 wanting to put construction dollars in.

15
16 Councilmember Floreen,
17 But you didn't.

18
19 Charles Sherer,

20 But did not. You said you wanted the college to look at their priorities and see if they
21 could shift some other projects around so as to make room for this. But what I put in my
22 committee report was that you did not put the construction expenditures in at the
23 committee sessions.

24
25 Councilmember Floreen,

26 Okay, so you're asking them to find money for -- within its -- within proposed budget.
27 These are just the additions? Right. More physical. Okay.

28
29 Charles Sherer,

30 If that is what the committee wanted to do was to put that money in for construction
31 expenditures and it's about \$5.5 million in [inaudible].

32
33 President Knapp,

34 I'd recommend that we did. I thought we actually made that recommendation, so that
35 was my mistake. So I would actually recommend at this time that we go ahead and
36 program those for construction, because that's the one thing I know that we can actually
37 do in both capacity. I see Council Vice President Andrews, Councilmember Ervin. Okay.
38 So that is a committee recommendation to go ahead and program that 5.35. No
39 questions on the part of the rest of the Council. And then moving to number three, those
40 areas where we actually went through and reduced costs; the capital renewal project
41 where we took for fiscal reasons reduced the six-year cost from 39 down to 17, which
42 was a new proposal from the college which we actually liked, we just weren't sure that it
43 was -- [inaudible] concept, it was ambitious. And so we scaled back how it moved
44 forward. Councilmember Trachtenberg, on this issue?



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Trachtenberg,
Yes, actually.

President Knapp,
Okay.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,
Okay, thank you. Well, I've been reasonably quiet here this morning, but I want to start my remarks by thanking everyone who is here from the college, and clearly for the excellent that you do in working with the community and young people included in that mix. Obviously you offer a very important opportunity for many, many kids. And I've witnessed that first-hand in work that I've done with kids here for years. My questions are actually specific to technology investments. I've been impressed when you've come before the MFP Committee at the wise use of dollars and the fact that in the investments that have been made over the years, it's really been a real assist to the staff, the faculty, but it's also provided again those opportunities to students. And given the fact that we have constraints around physical space and expansion, and given the fact that we have that changing demographic with a student body, so many of our students are in a position where they have both family and professional obligations. I wonder if you would comment the cuts that were going to be made, the reductions around the infrastructure and support systems, and specifically the student learning support systems. I would note in the packet that was provided to us there's a little bit of a description from the college around personnel costs on circle 7 and 8. And on page 7, the college had identified two areas that they saw as critical. One was the expansion of infrastructure and upgrading it. But also the other was the improvement of student academic instruction systems. Again, given what we know about our limitations, I just want to make sure that we're being forward-thinking in what we do here.

President Knapp,
And I believe that what the Council -- what the committee did was these were recommended increases by the college. What we ended up doing was basically going back to what had been previously programmed in both cases, I believe. So we just didn't agree to the increase but we kept it funded what had been previously appropriated.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,
Right. Okay. And to clarify what I said, but we reduced what originally had been requested. Dr. Johnson.

Brian Johnson,
Thank you, Councilmember Trachtenberg. We have Dick Leurig with us who is our Chief Information Officer, and is most able to respond to the questions about technology.



March 11, 2008

Dick Leurig,

Yes, Mr. Knapp is correct. It is the same funding we had two years ago. At that point in time we had projected out over a number of years the various projects, specifically for student information. This included things like student email. Included things like use of pod-casting, smart instructor workstations, which if any of you have seen our classrooms are really great, and the faculty, it helps attract faculty as well as the students; it helps with their learning. We projected that out. It was cut in half two years ago. And so we spread projects out, so this was trying to bring it back to where we originally had in our original plans. What happens is it would further delay some of the projects that we had. One of them, for example, is the use of students and labs and what they're actually using the labs for. It kind of falls under the generic term of tracking, but it basically tells us that the labs are used so much what they were used for. And in many of the courses like reading labs that we talked about remediation, we say you have to go to the labs and do some work, this records the fact that the student actually did it. Those are falling behind. They probably would fall out in fiscal '10 to '11 now. This is something the academic areas asked for. In terms of the overall infrastructure support, we've been working a lot with the state of Maryland; we've been working the Fiber Net that the County has. A lot of this is some distance learning, e-learning.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

Right, and that's what I'm particularly concerned about.

Dick Leurig,

It also connects us to the other schools in the state, both the University of Maryland and other community colleges. So what happens with the delay in technology is moves it out further.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

Right.

Dick Leurig,

Unfortunately, some of the things we purchased early, if you start delaying too much of the infrastructure, they have to be replaced as well because the technology does change very quickly on us. Our replacement has never been funded fully. We've had to move that out over a period of years. It's about 16 million a year, and we fund about half of it, the County and the college. And the student activity fee also funds 2 million -- 2 million 1 of that. So the delays in technology are livable in the terms that you can delay it just like you do with things in your personal. But unfortunately, the students that are coming out of high school and the instructors that we're hiring expect us to have good technology.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

Yeah, very much so.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Dick Leurig,
3 So that's the problem right now.

4
5 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
6 Well, and again, it's an opportunity for us to touch more students clearly, and keep them
7 engaged in that.

8
9 Dick Leurig,
10 So we would like to see if funded at this. There's also how much of it has to be funded
11 in the buildings, because when we have the building space there's a need for more
12 technology. So our costs in technology continue to rise as we keep adding building
13 space.

14
15 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
16 Well, I thank you for your response. I'm not going to ask that the money be put back in
17 at this time, but I would just suggest to my colleagues it's something that we really need
18 to be looking at because we're not going to get where we need to get with physical
19 expansion. And it would seem to me in the world we live in this is the place where we
20 have to make some very fundamental investments. And in my mind they're very much
21 commonsense investments. So, thank you for your response.

22
23 Charles Sherer,
24 Could I just mention that the one -- the college has four IT projects in the CIP, and the
25 committee did recommend to approve the largest one, approve as requested, which
26 was the IT replacement project. That's on page 1. Then the other three projects were
27 lesser dollar amounts.

28
29 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
30 Right. I did see that in the package. I still would like to see all four of them funded to the
31 level that was first recommended and asked for.

32
33 President Knapp,
34 Okay, I see no other questions yet. Very good points, and we are also -- have been
35 working with [inaudible] for the last three or four years to try to get as much as we can
36 on the technology side. Walk over to any of the labs and you will see students all over
37 the place and lines waiting to try to get on computers.

38
39 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
40 Yeah, and actually I participated in the women's studies program, and we've done a lot
41 of creative things online; not in recent years, I haven't had that opportunity. But I was
42 very impressed even when we did it three or four years ago.

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 So the last item here was site improvements, and there was a the College's request
2 which is 25.1 consistent with kind of what we talked through as we went through to try to
3 identify those projects that could be done and would be done in kind of a sequential
4 order. And we went back through and it was talking about Germantown sidewalks and
5 Rockville, and so we've scaled back from the 25.1 to 7 million for fiscal reasons but also
6 to try to focus on those projects that we knew could be completed in the right timeframe
7 without providing too much disruption on each of the campuses. Then moving into
8 delete and closeout, we had Fine Arts Building] renovations human health science
9 building renovation, the science and applied studies buildings 1 and 2, Takoma
10 Park/Silver Spring communication arts center renovation, are all for closeout. And then
11 the other issues were the Macklin Tower alterations were approved [inaudible] complete
12 all the work except for the library renovation. And we're trying to show the cost, but we
13 didn't show any -- try and show the cost in the narrative but not for the entire cost for
14 design and construction expenditure schedule. So we're just trying to make sure we've
15 got all the right costs before we proceed with that. The Rockville physical plant building,
16 the college said they need to go back and kind of rethink how this gets addressed; not
17 that it's not important, but in light of everything else that a new strategy may need to be
18 employed. And then with the roof replacement, given the conversation we had earlier,
19 that's kind of something we're just going to bear the burden of because it makes more
20 sense for us to do that and try and get the big dollars out of the State for other capital
21 projects. And then the final note that Chuck had in the report was the element as it
22 relates to the strategy relating to trying to maximize our use of state aid resources. And
23 with that, we have the committee report. Councilmember Floreen.

24
25 Councilmember Floreen,

26 Thanks. I just had a sort of wrap-up kind of question about the last page of the report,
27 circle 9; which shows that the college's overall total -- well six-year total request was
28 503 million. The County Executive recommended 326, and the committee
29 recommended 258 for the six-year totals. And my question was is that because you just
30 alluded to a couple of fiscal rationales for adjusting the dollars and I know that because
31 the bioscience building has gotten State money I guess subtracts those elements. But it
32 doesn't add up to, I think, as much as the reduction that showed -- maybe it is. Is that
33 the reason for the difference between the County Executive's recommendation and
34 yours?

35
36 President Knapp,
37 Which? The bioscience's building?

38
39 Councilmember Floreen,
40 Yeah. The 326 from the County Executive's recommendation, and then the 258 from
41 the ED Committee.

42
43 Charles Sherer,



March 11, 2008

1 If you think about it [inaudible] is a major difference because the Executive did
2 recommend funding for that -- showing an expenditure schedule even though it hadn't
3 been designed yet.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,
6 Yeah. So those are the -- ?

7
8 President Knapp,
9 That's the big one.

10
11 Charles Sherer,
12 And the main reason -- .

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Those are the big elements and then some modest adjustments on the way.

16
17 Charles Sherer,
18 And the main reason for the difference between the college and Education Committee is
19 not showing the construction costs until design had been done.

20
21 Councilmember Floreen,
22 And that's the difference between how the college submitted it.

23
24 Charles Sherer,
25 That's right.

26
27 Councilmember Floreen,
28 Than how the committee got -- okay. Okay, that's helpful. So there's a big uncertain gap
29 there that we'll be looking at in later years, basically.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 Yep.

33
34 Councilmember Floreen,
35 With respect to our relationship with the State and everybody else. Okay, that's very
36 helpful. Now I get it.

37
38 President Knapp,
39 Okay.

40
41 Charles Sherer,
42 Mr. Knapp, the Council then wants to show funding for the project at Takoma Park -- the
43 health science expansion, show the total construction costs.



March 11, 2008

1 President Knapp,
2 Yep. Okay. Dr. Johnson.

3
4 Brian Johnson,
5 Looks like you're about to release us. Can I just make one final comment,
6 Councilmember Knapp and members of the Council? What you see at this table really is
7 a reflection of your commitment to education in this County. When we hear from Dick
8 Leurig, who is our Chief Information Officer; John McLean, who manages our facilities;
9 our Associate Vice President for Administrative Services, Mary Shartle-Galotto, who
10 runs our academic and student services arena; you see before you educators at the end
11 of the day who have varied responsibilities, putting wires together so that students can
12 have email, but with a focus on what's the best opportunity this college can provide for
13 students. We appreciate your demonstrated commitment to education for this County.
14 And we very much try to mirror that in our diligence and our consideration for these
15 projects. We were visited a week ago by our Middle States Accreditation Team. We had
16 eleven visitors from across the country who know community colleges well, who came
17 and looked at us chapter and verse, turned every stone. And normally what happens
18 when a team like this comes in is they'll have recommendations for the college. If they
19 say we recommend these things, then the college has to take them very seriously. That
20 experience, you know, even though the intention is to be helpful, is when this team
21 comes in and says these are the requirements you must undertake. We didn't have any
22 recommendations as a college or any requirements. We had very collegial suggestions
23 from this team of experts. The eleven of them gathered had a range from one year's
24 experience in doing this to 35 years experience in doing this. I asked them in a sidebar
25 conversation if they put their heads together and just share with us how many colleges
26 they've visited where there had been no recommendations or no requirements, and the
27 group came up with a list of about six. So a small wonder that a year ago Montgomery
28 College was identified by the New York Times as one of the ten best community
29 colleges in the country. Our goal as you've stated is to move that up a notch if it's at all
30 possible, but certainly to maintain that level of excellence. Your focus on our requests
31 pretty much tells me you know it as well as we do that it's very impressive, and we're
32 deeply indebted to you for your commitment. And we're going to do our best to keep this
33 college moving forward.

34
35 President Knapp,
36 Thank you very much. Commendations to you on getting through your first year. You
37 navigated very successfully. You've made the transition very well. Congratulations on
38 the Middle State's remarks. That's very, very impressive.

39
40 Brian Johnson,
41 Thank you, sir.

42
43 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 And we heard from your opening comments that you've got a Council here that
2 recognizes and appreciates your mission, and is behind you to go and educate as many
3 students as you possibly can through all ranges of our community. You are linchpin to
4 the future of our workforce, and so we recognize that much of our future rests with both
5 you and MCPS, so go forth and do good stuff. Thank you very much. Okay, our next
6 item this morning is Housing Opportunities Commission. I'll turn it over to the PHED
7 Committee Chair; Councilmember Elrich.

8
9 Councilmember Elrich,

10 Okay. Thank you. This is the first time I've done this, so I'm going to -- I'm not used to it
11 yet. The summary of the PHED Committee recommendations on the first page, by and
12 large -- we can get through the different items. Do you want me to just go down the list
13 there? If people have questions, non-specific ones. Should I just shoot through the list
14 on there? Okay. So on the converting gym space to office space, HOC had a request of
15 a million -- a little more the Executive recommended zero and the PHED Committee
16 recommended no funding for now during the operating budget. For the customer service
17 center, HOC had requested \$500,000, the Executive had recommended zero. And
18 again, we recommended reviewing it during the operating budget. And for the Dietrich
19 Avenue improvements, they requested almost \$2 million; the Executive recommended
20 zero. And the PHED Committee had recommended not now, and to wait again during
21 the operating budget. Anybody have any questions on those three? Fiber Net for HOC
22 properties; HOC's request was 675,000 and both the Executive Committee and the
23 PHED Committee recommended zero. On the HOC guaranteed bond projects, we
24 supported the Executive's recommendation and HOC's request for \$50 million
25 authorized for bond projects. For MPDU property acquisition fund, which is a revolving
26 fund, HOC recommended \$20,507,000; the Executive recommended \$12,507,000,
27 which maintained the current level; and the PHED Committee concurred with the
28 Executive's recommendation. And on the Opportunity Development Housing Fund,
29 which is a revolving fund, all three groups -- the HOC, the Executive and the PHED
30 Committee agreed on \$4.5 million. Sprinkler system for HOC elderly] housing, HOC had
31 requested \$6,717,000; the Executive recommended zero; the PHED Committee split 2
32 to 1, and we started with \$100,000 into that fund. And on supplement funds for public
33 housing improvements, HOC had requested \$32,500,000; and the Exec and the PHED
34 Committee both recommended \$10,837,000. And other than the sprinkler system, the
35 votes were unanimous on that.

36
37 Vice President Andrews,

38 Okay. I don't see any questions at this point. So that report is accepted. And the next
39 item is the -- is also Housing Community Development.

40
41 Councilmember Elrich,

42 That was quick.

43
44 Vice President Andrews,



March 11, 2008

1 It was. Thank you all.

2
3 Councilmember Elrich,
4 Is everybody here from Housing Community Development? So we've got the PHED
5 Committee recommendations.

6
7 President Knapp,
8 Here they come. They didn't go too far.

9
10 Vice President Andrews,
11 Marc, you might want to have them introduce themselves.

12
13 Councilmember Elrich,
14 Yes, we would like you to introduce yourselves.

15
16 Rick Nelson,
17 Rick Nelson, Director DHCA.

18
19 Rose Glavinic,
20 Rose Glavinic, Office of Management and Budget.

21
22 Angela Dizelos,
23 Angela Dizelos, Office of Management and Budget.

24
25 Councilmember Elrich,
26 Okay. So we have the PHED Committee recommendations, again, starting on the cover
27 page. The PHED Committee recommended approving the Long Branch pedestrian
28 linkages project as recommended by the Executive, and to further discuss with MNCCP
29 how to get this project moving forward. And we also approved 3-0 the recommendation
30 of the Executive to approve the Fenton Village pedestrian linkages project, and
31 recommended unanimously to approve the South Silver Spring pedestrian linkages
32 project, with amendments to the PDF text. Any questions on those?

33
34 Vice President Andrews,
35 Not yet.

36
37 Councilmember Elrich,
38 Shift \$200,000 in current revenue from FY10 to FY11 in the Burtonsville Community
39 Revitalization project. That vote was 2-0 on the committee. Councilmember Knapp was
40 absent. I'd like to just briefly discuss this, because we didn't have benefit of some input
41 from Ms. Praisner's office.

42
43 Vice President Andrews,
44 Okay.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Elrich,

3 And in light of the information that was given to me in terms of that they're actually
4 ready to do façade treatment and signage, and a desire to do those two things together,
5 and that one single element of this, which is a tower sign at the park-and-ride lot alone
6 is about \$100,000. They had requested that we consider rather than splitting it over the
7 two years putting it back into a single year.

8
9 Vice President Andrews,
10 Okay.

11
12 Councilmember Elrich,

13 And though I voted 2-0 in committee based on what I heard in committee, I'm inclined to
14 agree that the \$200,000 we ought to move back into a single year, because it seems
15 ready to go forward.

16
17 Vice President Andrews,

18 Okay. I see there's a memo from Joy Nurmi on behalf of the District Four Council Office
19 on circle 19 and 20 in the packet that describes why that's important to do. And I'll make
20 a motion to do that, as you just described.

21
22 Councilmember Elrich,
23 I'll second that.

24
25 Vice President Andrews,

26 Okay, any questions? Okay, all in favor? All right, it's back in.

27
28 Councilmember Elrich,

29 Thank you. Approved facility planning, we have and HCD project that's recommended
30 by the Executive, again it was a 2-0 vote with Councilmember Knapp absent. We
31 requested further discussion on facility planning is defined, and how it is treated across
32 county departments, and how it's determined whether projects should be in facility
33 planning or stand alone. I think that's a familiar discussion with some of the other stuff
34 we've talked about. We approved the CDBG Capital Appropriation, again 2-0 with Mr.
35 Knapp absent. Mr. Knapp is absent because he's going back and forth between
36 committees.

37
38 Vice President Andrews,
39 He's doing double duty right.

40
41 Councilmember Elrich,

42 Doing double duty, right. As are you at times, as I understand. And we also approved
43 the Affordable Housing Acquisition project, as was recommended by the Executive,



March 11, 2008

1 again 2-0. And we agreed to discuss this further when we get into the Housing Initiative
2 Fund.

3
4 Vice President Andrews,
5 Okay, let's see. I don't see any questions. Mr. Nelson, did you want to say anything?
6 Okay.

7
8 Rick Nelson,
9 Thank you.

10
11 Vice President Andrews,
12 All right. Quit while you're ahead. Okay. All right. He'll take yes for an answer. Okay,
13 next item is also Community Development, Wheaton and Long Branch Redevelopment
14 projects; that's Agenda Item 7. And that's still you.

15
16 Councilmember Elrich,
17 Yep. I'm on a roll here.

18
19 Vice President Andrews,
20 You're doing well.

21
22 Councilmember Elrich,
23 Okay, first of all would everybody at the table like to introduce themselves; starting
24 anywhere.

25
26 Angela Dizelos,
27 Angela Dizelos, OMB.

28
29 Gary Stith,
30 Gary Stith, Silver Spring Regional Center.

31
32 Roylene Roberts,
33 Department of Housing Community Affairs.

34
35 Natalie Cantor,
36 Natalie Cantor, Mid County Regional.

37
38 Rob Klein,
39 Rob Klein, Wheaton Redevelopment.

40
41 Minna Davidson,
42 Minna Davidson, Council staff.

43
44 Councilmember Elrich,



March 11, 2008

1 We had two projects in front of us -- to approve the Long Branch Town Center
2 Redevelopment program as recommended by the Executive, but delete references to
3 the Long Branch Advisory Committee because the Long Branch Advisory Committee
4 has dissolved themselves for the moment, waiting to be called back at the next urging of
5 ourselves, but it is no longer relevant to the PDF. And we also -- and that was 2-0 with
6 Mr. Knapp temporarily absent. And then we voted to approve the Wheaton
7 Redevelopment program as recommended by the County Executive, and that was a 3-0
8 vote. Any questions?

9
10 Vice President Andrews,
11 All right, thank you very much.

12
13 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
14 Okay.

15
16 Vice President Andrews,
17 All right. The next item is General Government Projects, and that's the MFP Committee,
18 Councilmember Trachtenberg.

19
20 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
21 Thank you, Vice President Andrews. I am going to give a brief overview of this set of
22 recommendations. Suffice it to say, there was a meaty discussion that took about 45
23 minutes on a range of projects. And before I do that, I'm going to ask those that have
24 joined us this morning that are still here to make some formal introductions quickly;
25 although I have a feeling our conversation is going to be one that you like. But
26 nonetheless, if you could please make some introductions. Why don't we start -- yeah.

27
28 Art Holmes,
29 We looked at the committee report, and as you say, we are in agreement with the
30 report. We're here to answer your questions, or what have you.

31
32 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
33 Okay, did you want to make some introductions?

34
35 Al Roshdieh,
36 For the record, my name is Al Roshdieh; I'm Deputy Director for Department of Public
37 Works, and I attended the committee meeting. And as Mr. Holmes indicated, we concur
38 with the committee's recommendation.

39
40 Bruce Johnston,
41 Bruce Johnston, DPWT Division of Capital Development.

42
43 Angela Dizelos,
44 Angela Dizelos, OMB.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

Thank you for staying on so you'd be here in case we did have questions. As I said, there had been a lengthy discussion within committee around a number of improvements and projects. I'm not going to go through the whole list. There was discussion about the emergency power system upgrade for both the EOB and Judicial Center. There was a discussion around the data [inaudible] rehabilitation as well as the council office building renovation; which for my colleagues' interest is still on schedule as planned. What's noteworthy would be that we had asked not to closeout the Broom School renovation, and to retain a PDF for it, and show the design end of it in FY10-11, just like in the approved CIP from '07-'12 in the same amounts. And since the PDF to renovate the garage at 401 Hungerford Drive does not show construction costs in the expenditure schedule, only design. We wouldn't show any supervision costs either since there's really no construction to supervise. And for those projects showing planning or design costs but not construction cost in the expenditure schedule, we ask that a range of total cost be provided in the narrative so the Council and also the public would have some sense of cost down the road. And we asked obviously for that in relation to the 401 Hungerford Drive garage improvements, and the Broom School renovation. So in a nutshell, that's what the committee recommends. And again, except for those three changes, it's in complete agreement with what the Executive requested. So I would ask my colleagues to approve that at this time.

Vice President Andrews,

We've got Councilmember Ervin with a question.

Councilmember Ervin,

I do have a question on page 19, the Ripley District Improvements. I want a little bit more information about what exactly that \$100,000 is going to do.

Gary Stith,

Gary Stith, Silver Spring Regional Center. We'd requested these funds to be put in there for planning purposes. The area has a couple of projects that had been in facility planning that were done by DPWT in terms of the extension of Dixon and the Metropolitan Branch Trail. And those have impacts on Progress Place; and there are some other rights-of-way that are necessary to have. And so it involves several different departments and we didn't have any source of funds to be able to do any -- to coordinate these issues and work out what the potential is for the redevelopment of that area. And so we had asked for these funds to be able to do that.

Councilmember Ervin,

I just hope we're not putting the cart before the horse. We don't -- I haven't seen any plans about the overall vision for Ripley District now that NPR -- the deal fell through. And I know a lot -- there's been a lot of conversations on the Executive side about what's to be done in Ripley. So I just needed a little bit more information before I'm



March 11, 2008

1 prepared to support this funding for Ripley when there's nothing that shows what exactly
2 that is going to do.

3
4 Gary Stith,

5 Well, we would be consistent with the Master Plan. And the Master Plan calls for the
6 extension of Dixon Avenue so that it comes down and connects into Georgia Avenue.
7 There's also the Metropolitan Branch Trail. And both of those things impact on Progress
8 Place, which is an important public facility in downtown providing services for
9 [inaudible].

10
11 Councilmember Ervin,

12 I understand all that, but isn't there some conversations about moving Progress Place?
13 My concern is what is the program here? Are we going to piecemeal together the Ripley
14 District, or are we going to have some visionary plan to work?

15
16 Gary Stith,

17 No.

18
19 Councilmember Ervin,

20 Okay.

21
22 Gary Stith,

23 The County wants to leverage its property to get a comprehensive redevelopment of the
24 Ripley District; and that involves private property owners that would work with the
25 County. And we need some funds to be able to have resources to do this planning or
26 participate in this planning. Without those funds, we basically have to depend on the
27 private sector to tell us what they want, and we think that that could be problematic.

28
29 Councilmember Ervin,

30 Well, I'm going to look to my colleagues on the PHED Committee, but as the
31 Councilmember representing that district, I'm not getting any information. And if I'm
32 going to support the vision of the County Executive Branch, it would be good for us to sit
33 down and talk about what this might look like.

34
35 Gary Stith,

36 I'd be glad to do that.

37
38 President Knapp,

39 Councilmember Leventhal.

40
41 Councilmember Leventhal,

42 Well, while we're on that subject. It does -- Gary, you and I have communicated a lot
43 about Progress Place, and it seems to me that the urgency -- I understand that there's
44 issues with the Purple Line; I understand that there's issues with Metropolitan Branch



March 11, 2008

1 Trail. But when we were trying to land MPR it made sense that we might look for
2 significant alternative, I mean, moving Progress Place some distance away and actually
3 acquiring new property. The County owns a lot of acreage there. And so whether the
4 existing building can be retained, I suspect it cannot for Progress Place because of the
5 Purple Line, because of the Metropolitan Branch Trail; but at the same time it would
6 seem to me we ought to just keep Progress Place on that same County land. So
7 whatever vision we're articulating now that we don't have some gigantic anchor, some
8 highly desirable thing coming that we've been, you know, trying to incent (sic) and
9 attract, my hope would be Progress Place could basically stay right there. Not in the
10 same building, the same configuration it is right now, but on that County land. I don't
11 see any need for additional land acquisition.

12
13 Gary Stith,

14 That's part of what we need to be figuring out is -- two-thirds of the land that we own
15 down there -- and there's only about 66,000 square feet altogether, but a third of that is
16 parking lot district property, the other two-thirds is part of the Progress Place site. And
17 then it's being taken up by right-of-way extensions, it being taken up by Metropolitan
18 Branch land that's needed for that. And so what's leftover is not an easy configuration
19 for to develop. And so we need to be able to evaluate whether it would be possible to
20 keep Progress Place in that area and what the impact of that would be on
21 redevelopment, because the zoning there is CBD2, which allows a 4FAR. And just
22 putting a Progress Place on a site would be a real under-utilization of that property. So
23 we need these funds to be able to plan and evaluate whether Progress Place should
24 there, whether it could be relocated somewhere else in downtown, or what the options
25 are. And we'd be in a better position then when a development opportunity comes along
26 so that we're not running like crazy to try to keep ahead of it. In the situation with NPR, I
27 was significantly concerned that if NPR decided they would go there, dealing with
28 Progress Place and figuring out what was the best option for it would be very difficult in
29 the kind of time frame it was presented.

30
31 Councilmember Leventhal,

32 I would significantly concerned also. And now I'm not so concerned. So I -- .

33
34 Gary Stith,

35 But you don't want to be in this same situation again if another large opportunity comes
36 along that would redevelop that area, then we'd be back in the same boat where we
37 would not be prepared to know what we could do, what our options are.

38
39 Art Holmes,

40 What we -- we really need these funds if we're going to do any kind of planning.
41 Otherwise, what we're saying is that when you get a particular -- what did I say, an offer
42 or when you get something that's [inaudible], we will have no idea. So we're asking this
43 as planning money to be able to intelligently develop the place.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Ervin,

2 Just one last comment on this, and that is, you know, it's very distressing to me to
3 always have to make decisions on the fly. I mean, we are -- you know how to contact
4 our offices. This is right in the district I represent. I'd like to be able to support what
5 you're doing. But again, you know, we're caught in between a rock and a hard place.
6 We had to have that closed session last week regarding NPR; that was sort of
7 something that shouldn't have been a surprise to some of us on this dais. So, I'm just
8 saying this is indicative of a larger problem that I'm going to speak to personally as a
9 Councilmember representing my district when some of these projects should have been
10 discussed with me a long time ago. And as far as the members of the PHED Committee
11 go, I know that the Chair is going to propose that we schedule a meeting in PHED to
12 have the broader conversation here about Ripley and where we're going with Ripley.

13
14 President Knapp,

15 Okay. Councilmember Floreen.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,

18 Thank you. Yeah, there's a real problem here, and not sure -- I think it took me by
19 surprise to see this Ripley District conversation in this context. Because we spent a lot
20 of time in the PHED Committee talking about the other parts of planning initiatives that
21 were occurring in this area.

22
23 Art Holmes,

24 Right.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,

27 As well as, for example, the Burtonsville Initiative. So I think we need to do a better job
28 of allocating where some of these conversations occur, because there are too many
29 pieces that appear to be divided perhaps. I don't think with any great intention to
30 confuse, but the result is that we have a lot of parallel activity occurring without a good
31 coordination of initiatives. And what I heard Gary say at the beginning is -- I thought I
32 heard him say that this is an issue of finding resources to pay for this work. And that's
33 what drove the conversation and structured it the way it's being presented to us. But this
34 really should have been a community-development kind of conversation, it seems to
35 me. Or part of the Silver Spring Office initiative that requires more of a planning focus
36 on these conversations. So I think we need to revisit how this -- these kinds of projects
37 are handled, whether it's economic development, community affairs and planning, or
38 whatever. It's just in the wrong box, because we've had all the pictures and designs in
39 for some of these other initiatives, but not this one. And as Valerie says, this is a really
40 key conversation that needs to be had. So let's put our, you know, and it's not, I mean,
41 we talked about all this with the Metropolitan Trail issue and the Purple Line issue and
42 all of those things, and we need to have these conversations in an organized fashion so
43 we're not taken by surprise when something else comes along. And I appreciate the fact
44 that it's complicated for you all to make that happen. But it's even more complicated for



March 11, 2008

1 us to try to connect the dots, as we will be doing in a minute about the Silver Spring
2 Library. So I'd just say, I think it's admonition to us all as much as to staff to try to get a
3 handle around how we are reviewing these coordinated initiatives, and I would
4 commend the Chair of the PHED Committee to have us do a Silver Spring soup-to-nuts
5 kind of conversation perhaps to get all the right people in the room to have this
6 conversation. Because some -- not only is so much going on, so much is changing from
7 day to day.

8
9 President Knapp,
10 Councilmember Elrich.

11
12 Councilmember Elrich,
13 I think I share a concern about Progress Place. I mean it seems to me that if you're
14 going to move and that's what ultimately frees up the site, I guess the underlying
15 assumption is that you couldn't do -- you wouldn't want to do a CBD2 development then
16 have Progress Place on the ground floor of that. I mean that's probably the unspoken
17 reality of what would be considered undesirable. Which leads to the question then what
18 part of Silver Spring is desirable for that? I mean, it's almost like saying it's not desirable
19 here; so where are you going to decide is the desirable place? There was a reason why
20 Progress Place was located where it was, and, you know, not on what was perceived at
21 the moment when it was done as prime real estate free development Silver Spring. As
22 we redevelop every inch of Silver Spring, what's not going to be called prime space for
23 redevelopment? Then we still have this human need that needs to be attended to, and
24 we can't simply decide that every place is prime, and every place has got an FAR4 and
25 every place can be all this other stuff. And so, gosh, it's too bad this center doesn't fit
26 anywhere. Having said that, I mean, I think if that's what you're intending to do, you
27 don't need \$100,000 to look around Silver Spring and find lots that are of a size and
28 configuration that could hold space comparable to Progress Place. And if that frees up
29 that space for redevelopment, then you still have to deal with the parking lot district.
30 What it seems you really need to know is, is there a place to put Progress Place? And
31 then I think that's really the driver or the obstacle to redeveloping where you are right
32 now.

33
34 Gary Stith,
35 That's one of the biggest issues in that area, but there are other smaller issues that we
36 have identify, and don't have any funds to be able to address them. And so that's
37 another part of this. And I could go over those with you if you wanted.

38
39 Councilmember Elrich,
40 We'll have a committee discussion. I just don't know what funds we need to address.
41 We've got staff that can do planning. I mean it seems to me we already have resources
42 on board to look at an area and say, what's this earning, what's the potential use; do I
43 need additional money to do that?



March 11, 2008

1 Al Roshdieh,

2 I don't think the in-house staff resources are capable to go to the extent that you're
3 looking for. Of course, we do have architects and planners, but we do usually, in most
4 cases, hire a consultant to do this kind of planning for us.

6 Gary Stith,

7 There's also appraisals that need to be done.

9 Councilmember Leventhal,

10 But explain why is this -- right on this point. Why is this coming out of the capital
11 budget? We don't know what we're building. We don't know what we're doing. It's our
12 land. We got a service there. Why is it a GO Bond expenditure?

14 Gary Stith,

15 We don't [inaudible] GO bond [inaudible] necessarily in a one-year period. If it's put in
16 the operating budget, the money goes away. So we're setting it aside in the capital
17 budget to be able to have the facility planning so that over the next year or more as it
18 takes to develop ideas and address issues in the Ripley District. I mean one of the
19 issues that came up is we need to acquire some right-of-way in there that it looked like
20 there wasn't any other way of doing it except for the County to acquire it. But we didn't
21 have any money for an appraisal. And so, OMB said, well how can we -- .

23 Councilmember Leventhal,

24 Sometimes under circumstances like that, you guys come to us and ask us for a special
25 appropriation.

27 President Knapp,

28 I was going to say it sound -- I mean, just given -- what I heard .

30 Gary Stith,

31 Rather than come back piecemeal and deal with this, you know, one little piece at a
32 time, we wanted to set aside some funds so that we actually do it with this, I mean, this
33 is the prime area for redevelopment in downtown Silver Spring.

35 Councilmember Leventhal,

36 But the concerns you're invoking here, I mean, when you say deal with this; what is
37 there now is a service provider that's very important. And the County has a whole lot of
38 land there. And we have no big opportunity right now. There's no mouth-watering prize
39 that we're just waiting to reconfigure the site for. So it just seems very tentative, and it's
40 raising alarm bells for Councilmembers because it suggests that we're going to shove
41 aside this very important service provider without -- for what? To what end?

43 President Knapp,

44 Mr. Leventhal raised good points. I just wanted to make sure that Mr. Elrich who -- .



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Leventhal,
3 I apologize for interrupting, but it was right on Marc's point.

4
5 Councilmember Elrich,
6 I mean I would just as soon not have this in here and have a discussion in the PHED
7 Committee about what is the vision or plan for this place, and see how this all fits in. I
8 mean, frankly, if I was thinking of a prime place for redevelopment in Silver Spring, I
9 keep looking at the Lee property. If there's a hole that stands out as an eye sore that
10 says, you know, what's the problem in Silver Spring is the place on Georgia Avenue.

11
12 President Knapp,
13 That's another issue we've spent a lot of time talking about.

14
15 Councilmember Elrich,
16 No, I'm just talking about the parking lot. A parking lot on Georgia Avenue two blocks
17 from the Metro that just sits there. If any place is crying out for redevelopment, here's a
18 spot.

19
20 President Knapp,
21 Is that -- is there a motion?

22
23 Councilmember Elrich,
24 To take it out of here?

25
26 Councilmember Ervin,
27 Well, before we get to the motion, I don't disagree that there needs to be some work;
28 however, we don't have a plan. We haven't seen one. What are we paying for? That's
29 my concern is I just hear these ideas floating around, but there's no plan. If there was a
30 plan, I think we should pay for it. Because I believe that Ripley is a significant area for
31 redevelopment in downtown Silver Spring. We're not going to agree on that.

32
33 Art Holmes,
34 I may not be understanding you right, but I what I think I'm hearing is that you -- has not
35 been inclusive process. And what you want is an inclusive process. And that's what
36 we'll do.

37
38 Councilmember Ervin,
39 We want information.

40
41 President Knapp,
42 Hold on. Hold on.

43
44 Councilmember Trachtenberg,



March 11, 2008

1 I'd like to make some comments as the MFP Chair, please.

2
3 President Knapp,
4 Chair.

5
6 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

7 I want to point out that the discussion that we had within MFP was not so much more an
8 airing or a definition around a strategic plan. Clearly we were talking within the purview
9 of over site over facility. So when this came up for discussion that is the only way I recall
10 that I discussed it with my colleagues. I can certainly appreciate the comments that
11 were made here with over the last 10, 15 minutes, and the spirit in which they were
12 made. And what I would suggest is that beyond that being inclusive and really people
13 on this side of the dais having the opportunity to really hear about the vision and being
14 included in that conversation, and beyond the need for strategic presentation to be
15 provided to, no doubt, the PHED Committee, I would make a motion to remove this at
16 this time until we actually have more definition provided by the Executive Branch. You
17 know, having the charge that we do have within the committee that I chair, you know,
18 we get things that look like this. Basically everything and the kitchen sink. And so when
19 we looked at this, again, I just want to underscore it for everyone that's here and for my
20 colleagues, it was nothing more than oversight conversation. And it seemed like a
21 commonsense approach to provide some funding for planning. Again, remember the
22 conversation that we had was before there was a final decision made by NPR. So the
23 committee was still under the impression that that was on the table. So it seemed like a
24 reasonable way to continue what needed to happen if indeed we were going to have
25 that opportunity. So I've just made the motion to remove it for the time being.

26
27 Councilmember Leventhal,
28 Second.

29
30 President Knapp,
31 All right. There's a motion and a second. Councilmember Leventhal.

32
33 Councilmember Leventhal,

34 I think that some day the Ripley District will look different than it does now and that there
35 will be more jobs, more housing, more economically viable activity there than there is
36 now. But I also think that there ought perhaps continue to be a role for services to the
37 homeless in the space where it is being provided now. And I would and I have
38 continually urged Gary to not to make that an afterthought, that it has to be front of
39 mind. So I mean I'm going to vote, and I have seconded Mrs. Trachtenberg's motion,
40 because I just don't get how we spend GO bonds for something -- .

41
42 Angela Dizelos,
43 Mr. Leventhal?



March 11, 2008

1 Unidentified,
2 It's current revenue, sir.

3
4 Angela Dizelos,
5 If I could just say from a budgeting perspective, the funding source here is current
6 revenue.

7
8 Councilmember Leventhal,
9 Okay.

10
11 Angela Dizelos,
12 So in that sense whether it's in the operating, you know, it's still cash.

13
14 Councilmember Leventhal,
15 Okay, well that's a helpful clarification.

16
17 Angela Dizelos,
18 But right. Having it here does -- I would, you know, support that it does give us
19 resources to be able to do the planning. And it is planning only. You know, construction
20 has not been programmed into the PDF at this time, because, you know, agreeing with
21 Councilmembers, we're not ready for that.

22
23 Councilmember Leventhal,
24 I'm sorry; I didn't bring my CIP with me this morning, so I didn't have the PDF. The PDF
25 I don't think it was in the packet-- .

26
27 Angela Dizelos,
28 Right, it's not going against GO bond funding, it's current revenue.

29
30 President Knapp,
31 I guess the point I would raise that appears to be consistent is, as you've said General
32 Holmes, apparently there needs to be some more communication. There's some folks,
33 especially those folks who represent that area, Councilmember Ervin in particular, didn't
34 really know where this was going. And I think it's important to make sure we have that
35 dialogue. And so it sounds as though any number of committees may be having a
36 discussion about this over the course of the coming months. So I would encourage
37 some outreach on the part of the Executive Branch before that dialogue occurs.

38
39 Art Holmes,
40 Certainly there will be [inaudible].

41
42 President Knapp,
43 Okay. We have a motion before us to remove -- the 100,000 or the 250; 100,000 from
44 the CIP as it relates to Ripley District improvements. All in support of the motion indicate



March 11, 2008

1 by raising your hand. Councilmember Elrich, Councilmember Floreen, Councilmember
2 Trachtenberg, Councilmember Leventhal, Councilmember Berliner, Council Vice
3 President Andrews, Council President Knapp, in support; Councilmember Ervin
4 opposed. Okay the motion carries. I had one question as it relates to the Germantown
5 Library reuse. And I see Cathy in the back. And I apologize, Cathy. I know you called
6 before -- or Ms. Matthews. I know you had called before and we hadn't connected. In
7 the course of this discussion, I actually had a chance to go back and read this column
8 as it related to the reuse project. And I am a little troubled that we're not getting any
9 place with this, because we've got obviously lots of space that we know we need to use.
10 In fact, I just had a conversation with HOC again a week and a half ago that they have
11 been indicated -- it has been indicated to them that there is not space for them to use up
12 in the up county. I know HHS has been looking to expand, and I that was a part of the
13 plan. But I think the new library has been open for, I don't know, 18 months now, and
14 we've had this space vacant and a plan to use this space for a while, and we're not
15 getting any place.

16
17 Cathy Matthews,

18 We're getting a little -- we're getting there. We're getting there. Cathy Matthews, Up
19 County Regional Services. The project that we originally worked on is not in the CIP.
20 However, realizing that there -- that is good space, we do still have some other uses
21 and some other needs for the space. And we do have an interim plan to move several
22 services in there during this interim period until perhaps the funding situation gets a little
23 better.

24
25 President Knapp,

26 So wait. We pulled this out because we didn't have funding?

27
28 Cathy Matthews,

29 No there were a number of reasons why we pulled it out. Do you want to speak to that,
30 AI?

31
32 Bruce Johnston,

33 The interim plan that Cathy is referring to has been reviewed with her in the last couple
34 of weeks. We are looking into interim uses. There is \$515,000 currently in the project,
35 currently appropriated. And we intend this year -- this fiscal year yet to make certain
36 interim changes within the library to accommodate those interim uses using the existing
37 funding that we have. And beyond that we don't have an additional need for any
38 additional funds. So we're making that interim change with the funds that we have, and
39 those will be implemented over the next few months, and interim uses will be moved in.

40
41 President Knapp,

42 I guess I would observe that the library was almost two years late in opening, which
43 would have led us to believe that presumably we would have had a plan to reuse that
44 space well underway since we had the delay in the library. We've now had 18 months



March 11, 2008

1 since the library has been open, so effectively we had three and one-half years to vet
2 and be able to implement a plan. And we're not three and one-half years down the road
3 and we still -- we know we have space needs, but we still -- now we're back to a
4 proposal that quite honestly we could have put in place three or four months after the
5 library opened.

6
7 Cathy Matthews,
8 Let me mention, we did have a plan several years ago.

9
10 President Knapp,
11 Right.

12
13 Cathy Matthews,
14 But because of various issues -- budget issues during those years, we had to postpone
15 that. And then we also had to work with those various services, those other agencies
16 making sure their schedules were coordinated, et cetera. So it did take a couple of
17 years. However, the main thing is with this interim proposal the space will not sit empty.
18 It will be used from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and maybe on
19 Saturdays as well. So we're really -- we're feeling good about the fact that it will not be
20 sitting empty.

21
22 President Knapp,
23 And how soon will we have people in it?

24
25 Cathy Matthews,
26 We have a renovation plan that should probably take just the -- .

27
28 Bruce Johnston
29 I guess probably within the next three or four months.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 And who is going to be in it?

33
34 Cathy Matthews,
35 Gilchrist -- the Gilchrist Center for Diversity, which is using the space now.

36
37 President Knapp,
38 Right.

39
40 Cathy Matthews,
41 We'll reconfigure the space so it's a lot more organized for them. Refresh my memory;
42 who else is going in? Montgomery Works, who is leaving Lake Forest Mall and we're
43 going to be moving them in for the interim. And they are one of the permanent agencies
44 that would stay there as well. We're talking with Human Resources because there's a



March 11, 2008

1 need for some training space, which will free up some money -- some lease -- the
2 money that we're spending right now for leases. And that's the same case with
3 Montgomery Works. We're going to save a considerable amount of money taking them
4 out of retail space they were leasing.

5
6 President Knapp,

7 I guess I'm also struck by the irony that you're right; there were budget costs or there
8 were budget issues two or three years ago because it was projected to be so
9 expensive, at which point I believe the Council directed everybody to go back and see
10 what we could do for less money in various staging. And ironically, we're now going to,
11 three years later, go back and spend only \$500,000 to configure the space that we
12 could have done that way three years ago.

13
14 Cathy Matthews,

15 Well not really. The space isn't going to be outfitted in the optimal manner.

16
17 President Knapp,

18 Right.

19
20 Cathy Matthews,

21 It's going to be basically retrofitted in a very basic way so that those services can
22 operate in a more organized fashion on the floor. But it doesn't take into consideration,
23 you know, retrofitting the HVAC and some other things that would have to take place for
24 a permanent use.

25
26 President Knapp,

27 How much money has Montgomery Works been spending to continue to lease its space
28 over the last 18 months? What are their current lease payments; do we know?

29
30 Cathy Matthews,

31 I believe it's currently about 50,000 or something like that. We're not sure. We can find
32 out.

33
34 President Knapp,

35 Well, it's just kind of a typical example of we've taken almost three years to do
36 something we probably could have done in six months. And to go back to the number
37 that I think a lot of people on the Council thought we could have done it for in the first,
38 not necessarily to redesign the whole space, but to certainly outfit it in a way that we
39 could better utilize it and get people in there and to reduce cost, which we're now going
40 to do. But we spent, I mean, Montgomery Works has spent a year and one-half paying
41 resources for leasing at Lake Forest Mall which we could have saved by having them
42 there that much sooner. So it's just one of those things that, you know, time is in fact
43 money, and we've just wasted a bunch of it again. So I guess I'm just troubled by that. I



March 11, 2008

1 would urge us to with due haste to get this up and running as fast as we can, and to get
2 whoever in as we can as quickly as we can.

3
4 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

5 I actually want to comment on the comments made by the President. I actually would
6 agree with his frustration. And I can remember when we had the committee discussion
7 there were some questions raised about this. But I think it's so relevant to raise the fact
8 that again another item where we're not looking at the totality of what we're doing.

9 We're only looking at snapshot. And what happens is we're not taking a strategic
10 approach. So I guess my overall general statement would be that indeed this is another
11 example of where a long-term strategy should really be discussed collectively and it
12 would really be to our benefit, but quite frankly, yours as well.

13
14 Cathy Matthews,

15 And I agree. And I have to say that they had started talking about this project back in
16 2000, the year 2000. And a plan was put forth. But as I said, during those -- between
17 then and now a number of budget issues had come up and we tried tweaking the plan
18 and it never tweaked well enough. So we stuck with the original one, and we just had to
19 go through that time. But we share the frustration as well.

20
21 Al Roshdieh,

22 If I may just add, Mr. Knapp, the user that was identified before and the cost estimate
23 for the construction was fairly higher. The uses that were identified needed or required a
24 substantial changes in the space than what we are proposing to do now.

25
26 President Knapp,

27 Again, it's just taken us a long time to get to this point at a time when we're having
28 conversations about the Rockville [inaudible] and other places that's trying to
29 consolidate lease space. And here's a building we own that we could have done a lot of
30 things with much sooner. And it just -- time is in fact money, and we just need to try and
31 proceed quickly. Okay. Any other comments on general government.

32
33 Councilmember Ervin,

34 I do.

35
36 President Knapp,

37 Councilmember Ervin.

38
39 Councilmember Ervin,

40 Let me turn to page 17, indoor air quality improvements at the Brookville Depot. If
41 someone can let me know exactly what is being done to relieve this situation.

42
43 Bruce Johnston,



March 11, 2008

1 We currently have a contract to address the indoor air quality at Brookville Depot, and a
2 contract is underway, and it should be completed within the next three to four months --
3 three to four months.

4
5 Councilmember Ervin,
6 Okay. And are you -- are you all receiving complaints from the community also about
7 outdoor air quality?

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 Yes, we are. And we're meeting with members of that community on Tuesday. And we'll
11 look and listen. I have a study that they were looking at things that we've done and
12 things that we can do. And we will have a conversation with them on the 18th, which is
13 Tuesday.

14
15 Councilmember Ervin,
16 Okay.

17
18 Al Roshdiah,
19 I also met with them in Mr. Berliner's office. And they identified a number of areas that
20 they have concern. And of course we are taking care -- looking at those issues. And
21 certainly if there are any corrections needed to be done, we will immediately do those.
22 And certainly we want to be a good neighbor and we will look at their issue and make
23 necessary changes in our operating procedure if we can to address some of their
24 concerns.

25
26 Art Holmes,
27 We have their study and have the 11 items that they have come forth with. And we will
28 be discussing those particular items.

29
30 Councilmember Ervin,
31 Thank you. I know that Councilmember Berliner has a comment to make, but our
32 districts' about each other right there at Brookville, and so those neighborhoods have
33 been very concerned about the issue of outdoor air quality. So I would like to keep
34 apprised. I know that Mr. Berliner's office is working closely with you on that issue.

35
36 Art Holmes,
37 Once we have talked with them, once we've started to do things, I'll make sure that we
38 come to both your offices and let you know where we are.

39
40 President Knapp,
41 Councilmember Floreen.

42
43 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 Well thanks for mentioning this. Tell me how this fits in with their projects. I mean you're
2 reconstructing the Brookville Depot and you're supposed to be moving EMOC. So -- or
3 something. And so how does, I mean, how does this fit in with your basic capital
4 projects? I mean, we spent a lot of time on the Brookville Depot issue, their Purple Line
5 issues, and frankly we've delayed both of these improvement projects that you all have
6 tried to do at your best efforts. I'm not criticizing you in any way for this; but the question
7 is how does this fit in with your capital projects for both these sites?

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 This has no impact on the capital projects.

11
12 Councilmember Floreen,
13 Well I know, but if you're rearranging the sites then you're going to spend this money
14 twice -- .

15
16 Al Roshdieh,
17 Well, actually, Mrs. Praisner -- .

18
19 Councilmember Floreen,
20 Floreen.

21
22 Al Roshdieh,
23 Floreen -- I'm so sorry. Ms. Floreen, the improvement at Brookville is in building age
24 which is not being -- .

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,
27 It's a different building? Okay.

28
29 Al Roshdieh,
30 It's a different building.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,
33 Okay, that's helpful.

34
35 Al Roshdieh,
36 And its construction is almost complete. And this is the indoor issue -- .

37
38 Art Holmes,
39 Indoor air quality.

40
41 Al Roshdieh,
42 EMOC, again, do we have an immediate problem or a concern on the indoor air quality
43 and that is going to be addressed by that project at the EMOC.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,
2 Well right, but you're supposed to be moving the project.

3
4 Al Roshdieh,
5 Yes, but the -- .

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,
8 Facility altogether.

9
10 Al Roshdieh,
11 That certainly is not going to happen in the next year or two.

12
13 Councilmember Floreen,
14 Probably not.

15
16 Art Holmes,
17 As you know, we've been waiting for that for -- a movement for a while and they are
18 there, our plans for movement; however, the air quality problem in there is something
19 that had to be done right away. And that's what we're doing.

20
21 Councilmember Floreen,
22 So it's a venting kind of issue?

23
24 Art Holmes,
25 Yes.

26
27 Councilmember Floreen,
28 Yeah. All right.

29
30 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
31 Well the conversation here within the last half an hour has proved positive that we've
32 got to refine that kitchen sink approach. It's not the most efficient one. But I appreciate
33 the comments made by my colleagues, and I'm going to take them to heart and try to
34 work with staff to redistribute some of the workload, because in my mind of facilities
35 planning, while the oversight end of it might very well belong in the charge of MFP, I am
36 of the belief that it might very easily need to be placed, at least some of it, under the
37 PHED Committee charge. I just, you know, I remember my frustration when going
38 through this packet, because it was filled with so many items; some that had reasonable
39 overlap, but some in my mind that did not. So I know that there have been some sidebar
40 conversations here, as all of this has been going on. I would ask my colleagues, I
41 believe Council Vice President Knapp has some comments on the reuse of the Moneys
42 Worth Farm; is that?

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Andrews, yeah.

2
3 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

4 Yes. And I remember you were not -- you were doing double duty that morning, so you
5 weren't with the committee when we discussed this item.

6
7 Vice President Andrews,

8 Right. The question I have -- this is the bottom of page 17 in the packet -- is it says on
9 the Moneys Worth Farm reuse, the project will renovate the house at this farm so it can
10 be used. And it says the MCPS Kingsley Wilderness Project has been identified as the
11 preferred reuse for the farm. But MCPS has closed the Kingsley Wilderness Project. So
12 what is the expectation now for who would use the house at the farm, and has that
13 changed your thinking about the project?

14
15 Bruce Johnston,

16 I'm not prepared to answer that question right now; I don't know the answer. But I can
17 tell you that one of the requirements for renovating this project was not necessarily to
18 provide a use for Kingsley Wilderness; it was basically a historic preservation effort. And
19 we needed to do that to satisfy various easements that were placed on the property. So
20 that would not change our need to do the work. I'm not sure right now who is going to
21 be using the facility in deference to what you said.

22
23 Charles Sherer,

24 There is -- the information I got from somebody else at DPWT was that it would be
25 renovated to use as administrative offices for MCPS. That's what I got [inaudible].

26
27 Art Holmes,

28 I'm not aware of that being it, so I can't answer that. I will come back to you and tell you.
29 But as Bruce has indicated, it has been one of restoration primarily as far as we have
30 been concerned.

31
32 Vice President Andrews,

33 I think it would be good to get some more information on this about what the
34 requirements are in terms of the renovation of it and easements.

35
36 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

37 So we'll pull it out.

38
39 Vice President Andrews,

40 Yeah, I would suggest pulling it out for now, and come back to it when we get more
41 information.

42
43 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

44 Okay, I would agree with that.



March 11, 2008

1
2 President Knapp,
3 I don't see any objection. All right. Councilmember Floreen.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,
6 While we're on details, I've got a question about ALARF. And I don't have my book with
7 me; I'll bring it up later. But it says that -- it refers to the 33 million for the Silver Spring
8 redevelopment project. Which Silver Spring redevelopment project is that, Chuck? And
9 is it being repaid? Or is that for the Civic Center? Is that for the overall?

10
11 Charles Sherer,
12 For the overall.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Overall thing.

16
17 Charles Sherer,
18 I don't have the detail on it, but all the development was done in Silver Spring going
19 back -- .

20
21 Councilmember Floreen,
22 Since the beginning of time, the overall fund. Well maybe if someone could get back to
23 me to tell me what that's for.

24
25 Charles Sherer,
26 There's some detail in the third paragraph.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 Was for -- I guess it's been spent. I mean someone thought enough to put this in here,
30 so I'm assuming there was a reason.

31
32 Charles Sherer,
33 This is to buy land.

34
35 Councilmember Floreen,
36 Pardon me?

37
38 Charles Sherer,
39 The 33 million was to buy land for the project.

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,
42 Yeah, which land?

43
44 Al Roshdieh,



March 11, 2008

1 It includes Silver Spring. Are you talking about Silver Spring Library?

2
3 Councilmember Floreen,
4 I don't know. I'm asking.

5
6 President Knapp,
7 It doesn't say.

8
9 Charles Sherer,
10 No, I don't think the library is in it.

11
12 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
13 Yeah, we don't know and [inaudible].

14
15 Councilmember Floreen,
16 I'm told that we use Housing Initiative Fund to buy -- money to buy land for the Silver
17 Spring Library.

18
19 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
20 Right. But it was our understanding in the committee that it was for the library.

21
22 Councilmember Floreen,
23 Well.

24
25 President Knapp,
26 Let's get clarification.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 We can straighten that out. It would be handy.

30
31 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
32 That I remember.

33
34 President Knapp,
35 Let's get clarification back on that one. Okay, as everyone has now begun reading the
36 packet, are there any other questions?

37
38 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
39 And that was only with a mere price tag of 33 million.

40
41 President Knapp,
42 Okay. All right. I see no further questions on general government. Now moving on to, I
43 believe, the Fibernet program; right?
44



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
2 Yes.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 All right. Thank you.

6
7 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
8 And I would hope that this MFP Committee recommendation will illicit less controversy,
9 and we'll see. As my colleagues know, the fiber network connects more than 240 county
10 facilities, and I'm going to ask a few people that are still here this morning -- this
11 afternoon to come on up and make some introductions quickly. I don't believe that this
12 item, as I said just a few seconds ago, will illicit the same controversy; I promise.

13
14 President Knapp,
15 Careful what you promise.

16
17 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
18 Dr. Torgas has joined us from staff, and Steve, if we could do some introductions just
19 quickly in case there are questions.

20
21 Steve Emanuel,
22 Steve Emanuel, Chief Information Officer.

23
24 Barbara Gerrard,
25 Barbara Gerrard, Chief Enterprise Infrastructure Division.

26
27 Angela Dizelos,
28 Angela Dizelos, OMB.

29
30 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
31 As I said, our broadband fiber network connects more than 240 county facilities. And
32 clearly it's the backbone for our public safety systems. And what I would just state
33 formally is that with the increased need for secure communications, this investment is
34 really a necessary cross-agency project; that was clearly the opinion of the committee
35 when we discussed the proposed amounts. And pretty much they're in keeping with
36 what the Executive had asked for. And also I would speak to the prudent aspect of the
37 investment in the sense that the capacity that we are supporting is more than the
38 current demand, but that's a good thing because it means we're going to have our
39 bases covered for a longer period of time.

40
41 President Knapp,
42 I have one question.

43
44 Councilmember Trachtenberg,



March 11, 2008

1 Okay.

2
3 President Knapp,

4 We had a meeting last week with a number of our public safety folks representing the
5 community located near the transit center at Lake Forest Mall. And what we're going to
6 do there -- and I don't know if it's going to be a pilot project although it sounds like it's
7 something we'll do more of, is to put in place a number of security cameras so that we
8 can better monitor the transit center and the comings and goings of the folks there. One
9 of the most significant driving costs for that, interestingly, is the Fibernet piece. And I
10 was just wondering if we've been having any conversations with -- I'm not sure if it
11 comes through police or it will come through our transit services folks as to those
12 facilities being the types of facilities we also need to look at for Fibernet.

13
14 John Canstner,

15 John Canstner, [inaudible]. The amount of bandwidth coming off of these sites is going
16 to require fiber or something equivalent to it. And we're right now looking at wireless for
17 part of that link. The major cost from our perspective was to get fiber from that site down
18 Lost Knife and Montgomery Village Avenue. But we think wireless will be able to do it
19 for us. And from there we would then jump onto the fiber.

20
21 President Knapp,

22 So we think we can get enough bandwidth using wireless from that site.

23
24 John Canstner,

25 Yes, we do.

26
27 President Knapp,

28 Does that -- do we know what that does to the cost?

29
30 John Canstner,

31 Well the cost for the fiber was \$33,000; the cost for the wireless is 8.

32
33 President Knapp,

34 Okay, well that's good. So that makes that actually more replicable in other transit
35 centers as well then.

36
37 John Canstner,

38 Each one will be different. It just depends on where the center is.

39
40 President Knapp,

41 Okay. So that's a strategy that we're now employing is to look at -- because the meeting
42 we had last week, everyone was still using the \$33,000 number.

43
44 John Canstner,



March 11, 2008

1 Well we had a meeting two weeks ago with the fire, I mean, with the police department
2 and with transit services, and we agreed we would look at the wireless first. If the
3 wireless doesn't work, but we're pretty certain that it will, then we would look at fiber.
4 But our first choice is the wireless.

5
6 President Knapp,
7 Okay. All right. Good. Thank you very much.

8
9 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
10 Councilmember Ervin.

11
12 Councilmember Ervin,
13 Yes. Just a quick -- quick questions. How are we deciding the order of priority for
14 schools at MCPS?

15
16 Steve Emanuel,
17 As part of what the EID team had done, they have actually engaged an investment
18 strategy document that was shared with the ITPCC, which allowed them to give a
19 numerical analysis to where there was a cost benefit. But in addition to that, Barbara
20 has advised that we are also allowing the schools to assist us with the prioritization
21 based on business need. So we're trying to do it as a combination of, you know, what is
22 the most cost effective method based on, as John pointed out, almost every
23 implementation we do has some uniqueness to it. The distance to the existing fiber,
24 what we have to build out, so we're trying to weigh both. But the financial cost for
25 actually building in fiber to the physical location, as well as looking at the business
26 priorities that will drive what that school in particular would need.

27
28 Councilmember Ervin,
29 I'm very interested in that conversation. Maybe it's something we can take up at some
30 point. Just to make sure that there is a certain amount of equity being used as we look
31 around the County, which schools need what kinds of these services more maybe than
32 others do. So I'm just curious about how you're going to take that on. My second
33 question has to do with whether the franchise is paying for connections that are
34 mandated in these agreements. How are they paying for their -- how are these costs
35 being paid for by the franchise?

36
37 Steve Emanuel,
38 I'm sorry, I'm quite sure I understand.

39
40 Councilmember Ervin,
41 In other words -- go ahead.

42
43 Barbara Gerrard,



March 11, 2008

1 If I'm understanding the question correctly, all of these -- there was a large number of
2 sites that was mandated in the Comcast franchise, and we have already taken
3 advantage of all that connectivity.

4
5 Councilmember Ervin,
6 All right.

7
8 Barbara Gerrard,
9 What we are doing now is using the franchise as a contract, if you will, if their cost is
10 lower than other options, we're purchasing additional sites. But we have already used
11 up all of the sites in the franchise.

12
13 Councilmember Ervin,
14 Okay. All right. Thank you.

15
16 Costis Torgas,
17 Did you mean franchise paying for it in the revenue source; because in my memo I've
18 identified there were some fact that we're using -- .

19
20 Councilmember Ervin,
21 Where in the memo?

22
23 Costis Torgas,
24 The cable fund, and so I didn't know whether you meant franchise equals cable fund,
25 because we are using cable fund to fully fund the entire Fibernet project for the next few
26 years.

27
28 Councilmember Ervin,
29 Okay. All right. Thank you.

30
31 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
32 I think we also might just want to raise in a general kind of way is the escalation of
33 construction costs, because I think that's something that comes back in conversation
34 about this all the time. In other words, it seems to be a very big reason why the costs
35 are increasing. And I wonder if we could talk a little bit about that and some of the ways
36 we're going to monitor that. I know I've had conversations with colleagues about that
37 aspect of this, which is beyond the actual cost of the service. We're really having to look
38 at bearing increasing costs over construction.

39
40 Steve Emanuel,
41 That's correct. We are dependent on the Department of Public Works to help manage
42 those infrastructure and construction costs. It is my understanding that there was a
43 renegotiation of a contract that did significantly increase their costs, which are obviously
44 passed on to our project as well. So, you know, we have to depend on the negotiations



March 11, 2008

1 that DPWT did for the construction in order to take advantage again using the bigger
2 picture, and we don't want to go out and try to do our own when we have a master
3 contract of that nature that could potentially do it cheaper than what we could do it on
4 our own.

5
6 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
7 Well I know that I've had conversations with Dr. Torgas about this and asking that we
8 have some follow-up about that from DPWT. And that was discussed I believe about
9 three weeks ago within committee.

10
11 Costis Torgas,
12 Perhaps the easiest way to do it is to begin to invite DPWT to come to the discussions
13 of Fibernet, because they clearly become a major driving force for the cost. And yet,
14 they've never been at the table in those discussions.

15
16 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
17 Exactly. And we get memos, but I think it, again, goes to that whole concept of strategic
18 planning and really hearing from all the different departments. So with that, that is our
19 recommendation from committee.

20
21 President Knapp,
22 Okay, thank you very much. We now turn to libraries. Councilmember Berliner.

23
24 Councilmember Berliner,
25 Thank you, Council President. We have four -- seven libraries before us. I will ask our
26 wonderful staff Ms. McGuire to walk us through a few of them. I wanted to share with
27 my colleagues that there are three that are really not controversial; that is the David,
28 Olney and Potomac libraries are not controversial. There is the overarching issue that
29 Councilmember Elrich has raised with respect to whether one puts in construction
30 dollars, but that is again a larger issue. And there are no controversies with respect to
31 these three. So I would suggest that we move to the ones that are slightly more
32 controversial as opposed to spend time on that.

33
34 President Knapp,
35 Do you want to get a couple wins?

36
37 Councilmember Berliner,
38 I want to just -- let's go to the hard stuff as opposed to focusing on the easy stuff. And in
39 that same category, I would say that -- there you go. One of my colleagues would prefer
40 to have more of a conversation.

41
42 Councilmember Floreen,
43 No, I don't. I just wanted -- I just didn't hear you. Are you saying that for those you do
44 not have construction money?



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Berliner,
3 For -- that's correct. For two of the three we don't. Olney does have construction money.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,
6 But the other two don't?

7
8 Councilmember Berliner,
9 The other two do not.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 That's all I wondered. So the other two are ladies in waiting?

13
14 Councilmember Berliner,
15 The other two are -- that's right.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 And that's because?

19
20 Councilmember Berliner,
21 That's all that was proposed. And in the absence of this Council deciding that we want
22 to insert construction dollars in the later years, that's how we decided to handle it at the
23 moment. The other issue that I have suggested and the committee's suggestion is that
24 we postpone is the Gaithersburg Library. That was on the basis that to postpone
25 discussion of pending a report from Ms. Hamilton with respect to her discussions with
26 the County Executive, which was scheduled for yesterday, I believe, or the day before;
27 last week, excuse me.

28
29 Parker Hamilton,
30 It was scheduled for last week, and we did have that discussion. And Mr. Leggett did
31 make a decision on options. And we should have that information to you guys next
32 week at the latest.

33
34 Councilmember Berliner,
35 Good. So next week; we have deferred action on this until we hear the
36 recommendation. This has been a matter that is very important to the Gaithersburg
37 community as whether the size of this library is consistent with the needs. It has been
38 something that the library system has been working with the community on. And now
39 we will have a recommendation. So rather than act on this at this juncture prior to
40 getting the County Executive's recommendation, it was my suggestion and the
41 committee's recommendation that we defer slightly until they can catch up with us. And
42 then we will bring this item back to the Council at a future point in time.

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Okay.

2
3 Councilmember Berliner,
4 If that's okay with my colleagues.

5
6 Vice President Andrews,
7 That's makes sense to hold off until we get the revised recommendation from the
8 County Executive. And the reason it was important for the County Executive to take
9 another look at this is Gaithersburg was, prior to the opening of Germantown, the
10 busiest library in the County. I think it's still the second busiest; heavily used, intensely
11 used. And the original requirements called for only adding 1500 square feet in addition
12 to renovating the building at a cost of \$13 million, which did not seem to be sufficient
13 result for that kind of money. So I'm glad that they've completed the review and look
14 forward to hearing what it is. Thanks.

15
16 Parker Hamilton,
17 Well thank you for the opportunity. And I sure that our projects -- some are really not
18 interesting, some are very interesting, so it's very complex. So we appreciate the
19 patience of everyone as we work through this and come to the appropriate conclusions
20 with the community input. So thank you very much for that opportunity.

21
22 Councilmember Berliner,
23 So with that, it really leaves us with three that we need to have some conversation with
24 respect to each, of which have their own peculiarities. And so if we could, Ms. McGuire,
25 if you could walk us through the Clarksburg, Silver Spring and Wheaton library situation,
26 I think that would be appropriate.

27
28 Essie McGuire,
29 Okay, and with regards to the Clarksburg Library, the description of the
30 recommendation and the project begin in the packet on page 5. Now the committee's
31 recommendation relative to the Clarksburg Library was to approve planning and design
32 funds only in the expenditure schedule; not to recommend an appropriation for FY09,
33 and to change the funding source to GO bonds. The Executive's recommendation had
34 us funding source of development districts for the entire cost of the project.

35
36 Councilmember Berliner,
37 Council President.

38
39 President Knapp,
40 I was intrigued as I looked through this thing that we had a price -- or cost increase,
41 while at the same time we talked about the site situation still being in flux, and the site
42 actually being -- going down. So I was curious as to where are -- where do we actually
43 stand at this point. I mean, the funding -- the development district says a funding



March 11, 2008

1 source, or whatever the funding source notwithstanding, where do we stand with the
2 actual discussions of the project itself?

3
4 Hamid Omidvar,

5 Our first exposure with the project was we were approached with the community who
6 were working with the Park and Planning to develop downtown Clarksburg. And part of
7 that project was to dedicate a parcel of land to the public for a civic building named the
8 library over there. When we received -- and in -- as part of their effort they hired a town
9 architect and they developed guidelines as to how to design everything.

10
11 President Knapp,

12 As a part of the plan of compliance.

13
14 Hamid Omidvar,

15 Or for the down -- yes.

16
17 President Knapp,

18 Right.

19
20 Hamid Omidvar,

21 For the downtown -- for the entire downtown development. Part of that design guideline,
22 of course, a section of it was about the library. And we were exposed to it, and our
23 reaction first to it was that this is a mandatory referral project, it's a not a development
24 project, because part of the requirement was, for example, that the committee headed
25 by the downtown architect has vetoing power over the design of the library and whatnot.
26 And then there issues about the adjacency of the structure to other buildings. So we
27 raised our concern and then we received recently an updated version of that, where
28 many, many of those issues have been resolved. As we are speaking, Mr. Holmes, he
29 will meet with Mr. Hanson again, I believe it's sometime in next week or ten days from
30 now, and try to resolve the rest of the issues. So the question we think those solvable.
31 The question of the site, the location and our efforts, their approach, is something we
32 can -- we can resolve it. And the footprint of the building and the fact that they give us
33 10,000 square foot of the footprint for two-story 20,000, but then they also inserted
34 some landmarks and towers in it which will reduce our capability to build it. And it the
35 desire of the library to go in front of the public and review their requirements and maybe
36 rewrite the POR to find and -- .

37
38 President Knapp,

39 It would seem that we have a lot of steps to get to.

40
41 Parker Hamilton,

42 Yes, we do.

43
44 Hamid Omidvar,



March 11, 2008

1 But beyond that, we think -- I mean that's where we are; you asked for a status report.
2 That's where we are.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 Okay. So it sounds like we're still a long way from being able to proceed.

6
7 Councilmember Berliner,
8 Council President, as it was described to me on your same point, this was sort of a, if
9 you will, back asswards from the beginning.

10
11 President Knapp,
12 Recognizing all of the issues, that [inaudible].

13
14 Councilmember Berliner,
15 The technical word, that is the community's involvement with respect to this has been --
16 we haven't gotten to that stage yet. So this was a concept in somebody's mind that is an
17 important concept as we've shown in other communities. But the community itself is yet
18 to be engaged with respect to what is desirous.

19
20 President Knapp,
21 Right.

22
23 Councilmember Berliner,
24 So it just reinforces your point that we do have a long ways to go before we get there.

25
26 President Knapp,
27 Well I guess my next question would then be do we put the resources in for planning
28 and design; although we've not recommended an appropriation. So in order to actually
29 do the potentially revised POR, or to actually begin the design work, do we -- I mean, do
30 we need to have an appropriation to being to start that process, or are we not even
31 close to being able to begin that part of the process?

32
33 Hamid Omidvar,
34 We are ready. We think if the issue of the size of the footprint is resolved, which we
35 think it would be resolved, then we can proceed with it. And, of course, like any other
36 project, at the very beginning of the project we go to the community, discuss and seek
37 with the library -- actually they do it, it's there forum. And they seek an opinion about the
38 POR, validity of it. If there are items that need to be taken out or put back in, and then
39 we proceed with it.

40
41 President Knapp,
42 So how much money then would we actually need to begin that process?

43
44 Hamid Omidvar,



March 11, 2008

1 Well I -- we have provided, I think, in the program [inaudible] PBLs -- .

2
3 Essie McGuire,

4 The planning and development estimate that was provided by the Executive was 1.6
5 million over '09 and '10. Which would appear to begin -- .

6
7 President Knapp,

8 So that covers all the planning and design?

9
10 Essie McGuire,

11 It would appear to begin the planning and design contract -- that portion of it, yes.

12
13 Hamid Omidvar,

14 The entire PDNS is \$2.3 million.

15
16 Essie McGuire,

17 Right.

18
19 Hamid Omidvar,

20 I'm sure that may be the part that -- .

21
22 Essie McGuire,

23 The 2.3 does include some of the construction supervisor and later elements. The 1.617
24 appears to include the first two years of design.

25
26 President Knapp,

27 Well, I guess I'm still pretty fuzzy. But, I mean, I'm comfortable to go, I mean --
28 practically if we have this included as fiscal capacity, but don't -- haven't actually
29 appropriated anything. What's the practical effect of that?

30
31 Essie McGuire,

32 The practical effect is it certainly does, you know, maintain the space in the CIP for this
33 project to continue at this level. However, you're right, without an appropriation it would
34 require the Executive to come back with more details of the plan before they have
35 money to proceed. I think that was probably the committee's intent.

36
37 Councilmember Berliner,

38 So it takes up the space but without the authorization to go forward.

39
40 President Knapp,

41 And when would you come back to us and what would you come back to us with to get
42 to the next steps?

43
44 Parker Hamilton,



March 11, 2008

1 After we have with the meeting with Mr. Hanson, we'll have a better opportunity to
2 engage the community to talk about the programs, our requirements to see what needs
3 to be updated. The current spot that we have is more like a store front.

4
5 President Knapp,
6 Right.

7
8 Parker Hamilton,
9 The base on the population growth and the department's POR were at a spot where we
10 probably need a community library. And we need to ensure that the library is the right
11 size and the programs and services desired by the community is taken into
12 consideration. We've not had that opportunity.

13
14 President Knapp,
15 I'm comfortable with the committee's recommendation.

16
17 Councilmember Berliner,
18 Councilmember Trachtenberg.

19
20 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
21 I was not present for the entire HHS Committee work session the afternoon that the
22 committee had made this recommendation. And after the fact I went back and started
23 asking some questions, and one of the questions I asked was the switching from the
24 funding source to GO bonds from the development district funding; what does that
25 switch do to the positioning of the library in the queue?

26
27 Essie McGuire,
28 Well the committee's recommendation did not change the proposed schedule for the
29 library. Regarding the placement in queue, I think that's probably a more general policy
30 discussion. There's not a defined queue with assigned placements per se.

31
32 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
33 Right. And that's what I have a discomfort with. I understand that the PDF has been
34 modified so that the source of funds could be revised if indeed they need to be. And I
35 also understand the issues around the lack of a real substantial plan and issues still
36 existing around the formulation that eventually gets built. But what I really have, as I
37 said, discomfort with is the fact that we would leave this in the order that it's currently in.
38 And the reason I have a problem with that is because, you know, we, at the beginning,
39 when planning all of this, were depending upon the development district funds. We've
40 not made any definitive changes to that at this point. We haven't passed anything that
41 dissolves the empowering legislation. And we're also using the Master Plan as a
42 guideline. And while it doesn't explicitly state that the funding for the library would come
43 from development districts totally, it indicates that that would be part of the scheme that
44 would be part of the planning mechanism. So those are all the things that I've had on



March 11, 2008

1 my mind. But I'm not comfortable with the position in the queue that the library would
2 retain with the switching of this funding source.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 Councilmember Floreen.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,
8 Yes, I'm a little mystified about this as well, and particularly because I don't know what
9 these conversations with Mr. Hanson are. Whatever this plan of compliance is, we've
10 never seen it. And he doesn't have any authority to bind the Council to an expenditure
11 program. Did the committee discuss this? I mean, I don't know -- apart from the
12 development -- the funding issue -- .

13
14 Councilmember Berliner,
15 Councilmember Floreen, I would just say to you that the reason why we did not
16 appropriate any dollars is precisely in order to have these issues addressed. We did feel
17 that we should signal our intention to allow them to have planning dollars, but not until
18 such time as these fundamental questions were answered; including, quite frankly, the
19 appropriation was designed to address the issue of whether or not we go forward with
20 the development district or otherwise.

21
22 Councilmember Floreen,
23 But, yeah.

24
25 Councilmember Berliner,
26 So it preserves our option with respect to that, but without prejudging the outcome.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 Yeah. Well I'm glad to hear that.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 And I would just add to that the other -- the Planning Board piece, I know that there
33 have been a lot of ongoing situations -- discussions as it relates -- hold on -- no, but as it
34 relates to the plan of compliance and the town center plan. So it's not so much binding
35 to this. I haven't seen it either. But I know that that -- .

36
37 Councilmember Floreen,
38 [Inaudible].

39
40 President Knapp,
41 But those are the questions which gets back to the footprint and what actually goes
42 where. So that's the pieces that they're waiting on.

43
44 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 As far as I'm concerned, that's interesting, but, you know, that's their department, it's
2 not our job here at this point. And I'm a little concerned about this because I don't know
3 where this fits in the scale of things. Actually I wanted to say earlier when Phil -- with
4 Phil's comment with respect to Gaithersburg; that place needs a very significantly sized
5 library. We've been on that for four years now. And the idea that the Clarksburg
6 situation is going to drive expenditures in '09 and '10 is surprising to me given other
7 needs that we have. And as the committee lead on this indicated, there's Davis and
8 Olney for which we don't have construction money programmed; right? That's what you
9 indicated.

10
11 Essie McGuire,
12 Potomac only does have construction.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Davis and Potomac, which also are going to be -- that, you know, those communities
16 have been engaged; right? And intend for that to occur. The Gaithersburg community
17 has been all over us for a number of years, and I'm sure they're shaking their heads as
18 to why this issue hasn't been resolved yet. So to put dollars here when we haven't even
19 talked about that scheduled to me seems -- and because of there are these other
20 conversations occurring, it seems to me a miss -- well, I don't know that this is the best
21 allocation of dollars at this time given all those uncertainties in terms of the schedule. I
22 would propose that we take this out and bring it back when whatever plan of compliance
23 and everything else and the community engagement process has at least been started,
24 and we can look at it in the context of these other initiatives. Or at least push -- because
25 this is sending a signal here that we're going to start designing something for which
26 there's not even, as far as I can tell, a piece of land that we're clear about. What's
27 available for a footprint; is that what I heard from you?

28
29 Hamid Omidvar,
30 There is a dedicated and not yet dedicated, but [inaudible] -- .

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,
33 Dedicated -- .

34
35 Hamid Omidvar,
36 Delineated on the development plan a piece of property to be dedicated to the County
37 for the library.

38
39 Councilmember Floreen,
40 But it hasn't been dedicated, apparently.

41
42 Hamid Omidvar,
43 Correct.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,

2 So, I mean, we don't have access -- we don't even own the land much less have an
3 ability to proceed on planning something that has so many -- so many concerns. I would
4 move that we delete this and ask you to bring it back when you have more information
5 as to the -- .

6
7 Hamid Omidvar,

8 And we'll get back to you if indeed we do not have the land or not, I don't want to
9 misspeak. So we're talking here. We'll get back to you if -- .

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,

12 I'd say bring it back when we take up the plan of compliance and whatever else. I mean,
13 this doesn't -- that's a planning issue, this is a financing issue and a prioritization issue
14 for something that through no, you know, certainly no action here has been delayed
15 over time. And I don't see this as certainly as trumping the Gaithersburg issue.

16
17 President Knapp,

18 It doesn't do that.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,

21 Well, it -- it.

22
23 President Knapp,

24 But anyway.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,

27 They don't -- .

28
29 President Knapp,

30 So a motion has been made.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,

33 Yeah.

34
35 President Knapp,

36 Is there a second?

37
38 Councilmember Floreen,

39 I would propose that we take it out and bring it back.

40
41 Unidentified,

42 Second.

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Okay. We have a motion before us, and a second.

2
3 Angela Dizelos

4 Can I just make one comment; and I don't know if this will affect your decision or not.
5 But this is a -- it was approved in FY05. So something -- it's not a new PDF, if that
6 makes a difference.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 Yeah.

10
11 President Knapp,
12 It does. Councilmember Leventhal.

13
14 Councilmember Leventhal,
15 Well, I appreciate everything my colleagues say; we had precisely the same debate in
16 committee. And my first inclination was to take the PDF out altogether and then when
17 we decided we were not going to take out the Wheaton PDF and we were not going to
18 take out the Silver Spring PDF's for the same reason we thought we'd treat them all the
19 same simply and particularly out of my concern for the Council President's time
20 management, I thought our email inboxes might not have enough capacity to handle the
21 volume of communication.

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Well, that's another issue -- email capacity.

25
26 Councilmember Leventhal,
27 Yeah, I mean, I think if we -- if the headline is Council deletes Clarksburg Library, we're
28 going to spark a great deal of anxiety and concern. And ultimately there will be a
29 Clarksburg Library, but there is -- this is -- this whole set of recommendations, and it's
30 certainly not Mr. Berliner's fault; he's done a very good job keeping -- getting up to
31 speed on the details here. And I don't want to blame anyone. But there's just a lot of
32 uncertainty. There are things we don't know about Clarksburg, about Wheaton, about
33 Silver Spring, about Gaithersburg. And the administration is trying to work through it,
34 and it just happens that right now we're working on the CIP. We may have the answers
35 eight months from now; we may have answers fourteen months from now. But right now
36 is when the Council is acting on the CIP. And so the question is, do you delete a PDF,
37 and this was my initial inclination was to delete it altogether. I'm not going to vote for the
38 motion though. I think we should keep working on a plan for a Clarksburg Library, and
39 that if we delete this altogether, it suggests that we aren't going to build a Clarksburg
40 Library, and it will be very difficult to explain to any community members anything
41 different. If you delete the PDF, it suggests you're not going to build the project. So even
42 though -- I don't mean the sponsor of the motion has that in mind; I think the sponsor of
43 the motion anticipates that some day in the future we will build a Clarksburg Library; to



March 11, 2008

1 vote to delete it didn't feel good to me, even though I started out in the same place. We
2 had that discussion in committee.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Well.

6
7 Councilmember Leventhal,
8 I also, if I could just for a moment -- I also -- I commend the Chair of the MFP
9 Committee who is paying attention, and you're absolutely right that we also had
10 discussion about the funding source for this project in committee. And I stated that I
11 wouldn't vote for a PDF that was funded with development district funds, because,
12 along with the Council President, it is my view that we should not have the development
13 district imposed in Clarksburg, and therefore I wouldn't vote for a PDF that contained
14 that. So there is, I think, a difference of views among Councilmembers on that. And that
15 also did come up in committee, and that remains my view. So I wouldn't vote for a PDF
16 that funded it out of development -- I won't vote for a PDF that funds it out of
17 development district dollars. So there's a lot of uncertainty here. And that's anybody's
18 fault -- well, the one thing I would say, which is sort of interesting given everything else
19 about Clarksburg, is one of the requirements for the developers of Town Center was
20 that they donate land for a library, and whoops, it's not big enough. So that's something
21 that's going to have to be addressed. Again, I'm not pointing fingers at anybody, but it
22 appears that the site is not adequate for the need. So anyway, my view still remains,
23 although it is an odd way of doing business, and we had extensive discussion in
24 committee about it, that we should signal our intent to plan and design a Clarksburg
25 Library, and that would be my preference, acknowledging that there are many things
26 that are left, you know, still unresolved.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 Well, in my view that would be -- we may differ on funding sources and the like, but to
30 put almost one and a half million dollars in for funding right now with all those
31 uncertainties, even as to the nature of the facility. And whenever other community
32 conversations are occurring, and I know they've been going on apparently are not
33 resolvable given the number of years it has continued. This says it's starting right off the
34 bat, and it's not. It can't physically. That, you know, I'm all for -- I couldn't be a greater
35 advocate for libraries of this County, but there are just so many uncertainties here. The
36 message part of the budget, sure; but as you know we're all -- we have -- all the
37 committees have different approaches to solving this, so I stick by my -- .

38
39 President Knapp,
40 Council Vice President Andrews.

41
42 Vice President Andrews,
43 Thank you, Council President. Well, it is a little complicated on this one. There will be a
44 Clarksburg Library, and there should be a Clarksburg Library. And I don't think that it



March 11, 2008

1 would make sense to delete the PDF. But I also think that the current schedule that's
2 outlined there creates false expectations and is unrealistic. And, unlike Councilmember
3 Leventhal, I want to see development district funds used for a portion, at least, of the
4 library. So I think that the PDF needs to be changed to reflect the current level of
5 uncertainty that I think everyone agrees is there. I don't have a specific schedule to
6 propose, and maybe we could come back on that.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 That would be fine.

10
11 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
12 I don't [inaudible] want to do that.

13
14 Vice President Andrews,
15 I can't support the current proposal for a timeline.

16
17 Councilmember Trachtenberg
18 Could we do that?

19
20 President Knapp,
21 I can do that.

22
23 Councilmember Berliner,
24 Maybe suggest to Council President and my colleagues that since we are coming back
25 on Gaithersburg that we put this in that same track and see. We may end up having a
26 similar conversation about a couple of the others as well.

27
28 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
29 That's what I want [inaudible] change of schedule.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 Well let's see. What I actually might recommend is since it's 25 of 1, and we've now
33 pushed off two of the projects in here -- and it's your birthday.

34
35 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
36 That's right. And we have a birthday lunch.

37
38 President Knapp,
39 Council Vice President Andrews will sing to Councilmember Trachtenberg in just a
40 moment the birthday song. I would propose that we actually get those modifications and
41 any other questions that still need to be resolved brought back, and we'll just bring this
42 whole -- bring the whole library back at the next full Council session. I'm looking to Ms.
43 Lauer to see if that's something that's a doable scenario, if she's -- .



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
2 I think that makes sense.

3
4 President Knapp,
5 Let's do that.

6
7 Councilmember Leventhal,
8 Could we do that Public Arts Trust, because it will take two minutes?

9
10 President Knapp,
11 Yeah, we can do that. Okay. So let's do that. Let's get questions -- answers to
12 questions. Let's bring this back, and then we can actually make a more informed
13 decision. What a concept. And with that we will turn to the -- what do we have -- the
14 Public Arts Trust is our final item -- final agenda item before we break for lunch.

15
16 Councilmember Berliner,
17 Council President, if I could suggest that without further conversation, I would urge my
18 colleagues to support this. It is about the least controversial thing that we are about to
19 do today. If you take a quick look at it you will see we're -- we should be done and go to
20 lunch.

21
22 President Knapp,
23 And yet I see one question. Councilmember Elrich.

24
25 Councilmember Berliner,
26 No, no. He didn't mean it. He didn't mean it. He takes it back.

27
28 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
29 It was on the library.

30
31 President Knapp,
32 He did take it back.

33
34 Councilmember Berliner,
35 He takes it back.

36
37 President Knapp,
38 Okay, comments, questions? Okay. Our Public Arts Trust is recommended, is
39 approved. Moving ahead for reconciliation.

40
41 Vice President Andrews,
42 Sometimes the waiting is the hardest part.

43
44 President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

- 1 Okay, we are in recess until 1:30, when we have a public hearing right back here.
- 2 Thank you very much.
- 3
- 4
- 5

March 11, 2008



TRANSCRIPT
March 11, 2008

MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

PRESENT

Councilmember Michael Knapp, President
Councilmember Roger Berliner
Councilmember Valerie Ervin
Councilmember George Leventhal

Councilmember Phil Andrews, Vice-President
Councilmember Marc Elrich
Councilmember Nancy Floreen
Councilmember Duchy Trachtenberg



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,

2 Okay. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing on a Special
3 appropriation to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission's FY08
4 Operating Budget in the amount of \$1,230,400 for the Planning Department, \$749,000
5 for the Development Review Special Revenue Fund and \$403,00 for the Department of
6 Parks. A Planning Housing and Economic Development Committee worksession is
7 tentatively scheduled for March 31, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. Persons wishing to submit
8 additional comments should you do so by the close of business on Tuesday, March
9 18th so the individual views can be included in the material which staff will prepare for
10 the Council consideration. Before beginning your presentation please state your name
11 clearly for the record. I believe we have one speaker. Dr. Royce Hanson of the
12 Montgomery County Planning Board.

13
14 Royce Hanson,

15 Thank you Mr. President. I'm Royce Hanson, Chairman of the Montgomery County
16 Planning Board. And you've got written testimony in a letter from me. I just want to
17 emphasize a few points about the material that has been submitted. This request for a
18 Special appropriation is in response to the Council's suggestion made when you
19 approved our two percent savings plan that it would consider such a request. There are
20 three situations that bring this request to you. First, when our 2008 budget was
21 approved by the Council, a seven and a half percent salary lapse was imposed. But the
22 number of authorized positions in each department was increased. You told us to recruit
23 aggressively to fill vacant and new positions and return for a Supplemental
24 appropriation if we were successful. We have been successful. The current vacancy
25 rate is three percent in Planning and four and a half percent in Parks. Our requests for
26 each department are to fund positions that have been filled as we were encouraged to
27 do. A portion of the Planning request is for unexpected costs and repairs to the MRO
28 building to keep it habitable and functioning. The sources of funding for both of these
29 departmental requests are respectively the administrative fund and the park fund
30 reserves. If these funds are not provided, we'll need to take immediate measures to
31 terminate employees, most likely those most recently hired. Second, the shortfall in
32 Special Revenue Fund is a result of the slowdown in large development applications.
33 The number of applications has actually declined only eleven percent but the fees
34 collected for these applications have declined by over 50 percent from past year. The
35 Special Revenue Fund has been in existence for only two years. It produced a surplus
36 the first year, the last boom year for development, but is running a large deficit in the
37 bust year. We've used the entire surplus of \$885,000 to maintain development review
38 operations and we'll need an additional \$748,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year.
39 We still have a considerable backlog of applications to process. We have only recently
40 filled critical development review positions. We don't think that this is an appropriate
41 time to raise fees and that this is a true rainy day situation and we're recommending
42 tapping the County General Fund undesignated revenues for this appropriation. Again,
43 if funding is not provided we'll have to reduce the development review staff with serious
44 consequences, not only for the current level of service but even more serious problems



March 11, 2008

1 when development activity resumes. Such a reduction in force will have a considerable
2 ripple effect on other programs as it becomes necessary to reassign staff from other
3 divisions to complete work on pending applications. Third the request for \$539,000 is for
4 support of projects that were assigned to the Board staff in the growth policy adopted in
5 November. If these funds are not provided, we'll have to, we won't be able to conduct
6 the work without substantial changes in the work program because if we're going to
7 conduct that work without the additional funds it will have to come out of somewhere
8 else and that means other things that we have promised will have to be unpromised or
9 changed or delayed. Thank you.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 Okay. Thanks to you.

13
14 Royce Hanson,
15 Send money.

16
17 Council President Knapp,
18 Thank you very much Dr. Hanson. I see no questions. I'm sure we'll have a very
19 engaging worksession.

20
21 Royce Hanson,
22 I hope a very productive one.

23
24 Council President Knapp,
25 Thank you very much.

26
27 Royce Hanson,
28 Thank you.

29
30 Council President Knapp,
31 And this concludes this public hearing. We now.

32
33 Royce Hanson,
34 Mr. President, while I'm here and have the opportunity to do so, I have not had an
35 opportunity to introduce all of to you Rollin Stanley who is our new Planning Director.
36 Some of you have met him individually, but I just wanted to introduce Rollin to you
37 officially at this point.

38
39 Council President Knapp,
40 Welcome. It's been a long time in coming. We're glad that you're here and we look
41 forward to working with you. Thank you very much. Okay. We now turn to our
42 worksession for the FY09-14 Capital Improvements Program, Transportation. I turn to
43 the Chair of the T&E Committee, Councilmember Floreen.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,
2 Well, thank you very much Council President. You have the Committee
3 recommendation before you.

4
5 Council President Knapp,
6 Shall we move adoption? There we go.

7
8 Councilmember Andrews
9 Not so fast. Not so fast.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 Somebody didn't get lunch, huh?

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 No, it's clear we could just proceed. Glenn has provided you with various addendums
16 but I'm just going to work from the basic packet which is 40 pages of detail at various
17 levels. By and large the Committee supports it, the County Executive's
18 recommendations. We've made a few adjustments, most significantly we've added two
19 major projects to the CIP. That is the North County Maintenance Depot and the
20 Bethesda South Entrance to the Metro Station. Those are our most significant
21 initiatives. However, on the scale of the train wreck that Glenn alluded to earlier in the
22 day, ours is only a modest contribution to that basic problem. So we feel pretty good
23 about our recommendations. Since there is not a majority of the Council here, I don't
24 know how you want to proceed. I could wax poetic.

25
26 Councilmember Andrews
27 Now there is.

28
29 Council President Knapp,
30 Now there is.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,
33 Here's somebody. If you turn to page three of Glenn's packet, you will see the sad story
34 of transportation funding in Montgomery County. The golden years of transportation
35 funding to the extent that they existed were in now, they were in the late 1980s.

36
37 Council President Knapp,
38 I was going to say, when were they exactly?

39
40 Councilmember Floreen,
41 And to the extent they were, at this point the current piece of the County CIP, the
42 Transportation claims is the lowest in ten years. And I think that's important to know.
43 Glenn has run the numbers in various ways of looking at this, but it is at bottom a one
44 percent reduction over the last CIP. So it has been a challenge, despite the fact that our



March 11, 2008

1 people are driving more and taking the buses more and our population is growing,
2 Transportation has, as usual, failed to get the funding support that it should have. But at
3 least we're trying. And that's what we're doing here. And Glenn's very short charts
4 reflect that in terms of its competition for capital funds in the budget as vis-à-vis other
5 agencies and departments. And I suppose the good news is that we have over the past
6 few years adopted some policy initiatives that would help us address congestion on our
7 most challenging situations and as former, people who, Phil and Michael, recall that was
8 our initiative for state transportation participation so that we could advance some
9 projects where the state is involved, the state's obligation to expand its commitment to
10 transportation in Montgomery County continues to lag, but we have at least come up
11 with some solutions for addressing some partnership initiatives and we will talk about
12 that in a little bit. But basically, and that is not funded with General Obligation Bonds. So
13 it is not part of the train wreck Glenn had described earlier. It continues to be a
14 challenge because our biggest problems are on the state roads. And so, and that is
15 really not the focus of this conversation. And the state's obligation to work on those
16 initiatives is a jawboning one of cooperation and partnership, unlike the College, we
17 don't have the same direct percentage relationship with the state as we would like to
18 see. But our relationship has been improving, and I think we can thank General Holmes
19 and the County Executive for maintaining those relationships. With that, Art, did you
20 want to make any initial comments?

21
22 Art Holmes,

23 No, I think as we went through the Committee sessions, we voiced our opinions and
24 we'll answer your questions.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,

27 Okay. There is quite a laundry list of projects here. And I think what I'm just going to go,
28 I'm just going to walk through them and if anybody has an issue, what not, you can raise
29 them. I will highlight what the Committee recommendation is for each one. The
30 beginning on page five and six are, technically speaking, consent projects where there
31 really aren't any changes to the County Executive's recommendation. And I'll just
32 mention in this area, we have made some adjustments to schedules and to costs based
33 on staff analysis on page six, but nothing significant. So in other words, with respect to
34 bridge renovation, we did increase the funding for that initiative because of its safety
35 issues.

36
37 Council President Knapp,
38 I was going to ask about that.

39
40 Councilmember Floreen,

41 Clarksburg Road Bridge, we supported the County Executive's approach on this. Some
42 of this is our conversation with Council staff, Mr. Orlin, on this. So there's no change to
43 the Clarksburg Road Bridge. It's in the CIP.



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,

2 I just wanted to get a sense of, from staff as to where things stand with this bridge and
3 where the recommendation came from? Obviously we don't want any unsafe bridges.
4 And the bridge report that came out a couple of years ago, obviously there were lots of
5 bridges that are less than stellar but are generally okay. So where is this one? And
6 what, I mean, what's a year to get us one way or the other?

7
8 Glenn Orlin,

9 The Executive's recommendation is in circle, if you look on the underlying PDF, on circle
10 16, you'll see they recommend funding for design and construction, actually it's
11 construction really, in fiscal years '10 and '11. Typically, not always, but typically, you
12 know the bridge projects that go through facility planning are really going through design
13 and there are a lot of bridges in the County and only the ones that are most desperately
14 in need of rehabilitation or reconstruction get into the facility planning bridges project.
15 So we try to make a practice of as soon as a bridge project gets through facility planning
16 to program it for construction right away because there isn't that much more of a safety
17 issue than you think of on the transportation system than a failing bridge. This one is
18 scheduled for '10 and '11 from a production standpoint and this is key because on the
19 next project, East Gude Drive, it's, it wouldn't be the case. But in the case of this bridge
20 they could do the project in fiscal years '09 and '10. And that was my reason why I
21 recommended showing it on a '09 and '10 schedule rather than '10 and '11. And it's
22 relatively inexpensive project anyway. It's only one and a half million dollars. But it is a
23 low volume bridge. I mean, you know, if the bridge fails that's a bad thing, of course. But
24 it's in an area where there's not that many people using it. And it's a, it's in a rural area.

25
26 Council President Knapp,

27 Well, that was going to be my question though, this notion of how many people are
28 using it. You know, as we had the discussion through the Damascus Master Plan, go up
29 27 any day of the week and 27 is backed up and from what I can tell since, if I were a
30 County resident and were sitting in that traffic each and every day, I would be calling
31 down here a lot to tell us how bad it was and I don't get that many phone calls which
32 leads me to believe that it's everybody coming from points north of Montgomery County
33 which the Damascus Master Plan seemed to bear out. But that also means that we
34 know people are taking lots of other roads since we didn't do the Damascus Bypass.
35 And so my question would be, as we look at Clarksburg Road and some others, is this
36 bearing additional overflow traffic which would then kind of mean that it deteriorates
37 further? I have no doubt that it was once a rural road and not getting much traffic, but is
38 that still the case and have we monitored that at all?

39
40 Glenn Orlin,

41 Well, the PDF says it's 4141, that exact, but let's say 4100 vehicles a day using the
42 road, which is a fairly low volume. And for a rural road it's actually not so low, but
43 compared to most the roads that you're talking about in the County, it's fairly low.



March 11, 2008

1 Art Holmes,

2 When you look at it, you look in terms of the condition of the bridge itself. And it is in
3 fairly bad condition, spalling, cracking and deterioration of the bridge. And we would
4 really think that this particular bridge, as far as structural adequacy is concerned is rated
5 very low and so that's why we have it in the program.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,

8 Yeah. So it's there. Again, it's a question of what we can do and when we can do it?

9
10 Council President Knapp,

11 Well, I guess that was my question back at the Committee is, was there, is it a fiscal
12 capacity issue? So I mean, because in our presentation.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,

15 Well, we, if left to the Committee, we would move everything up to '09 and '10. And the
16 challenges, you know, you will see, we can always come back to this at a later point, but
17 this is not the only bridge, Takoma Park has bridge issues, lots of people have issues.
18 And the question is again an issue of how much we can fund. We actually were very
19 careful with respect to '09 and '10.

20
21 Council President Knapp,

22 I guess that was my question.

23
24 Councilmember Floreen,

25 But that is a fiscal issue.

26
27 Council President Knapp,

28 Well, relative to Glenn's presentation this morning, actually '09 was looking as good as
29 any year was. And so, does it make sense to try and put some things back to that.

30
31 Councilmember Floreen,

32 Well, if we're going to do that, some of us would add in the bike way program and the
33 sidewalk program. I mean, you know, there are a lot of competing initiatives here. And if
34 you want to highlight it, you can proceed however you like. Some people would say we
35 need to, and you will see the other things that we have moved up.

36
37 Council President Knapp,

38 Okay. Well.

39
40 Councilmember Floreen,

41 For that. So it's not that you're wrong.

42
43 Council President Knapp,

44 The second thing we've seen.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Floreen,
3 Yeah.

4
5 Council President Knapp,
6 So, I would reserve the right.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 We're warming up.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 To come back relative to other things.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Absolutely.

16
17 Council President Knapp,
18 That we have coming as we address them.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 You betcha. And one thing I would mention is that, the T&E Committee did put in
22 construction money, I think, for everything right Glenn? Where we could? Pretty much.
23 Unlike some Committees, we are facing the music. I think that's fair to say. Isn't that
24 right Glenn, mostly? There are a few areas where.

25
26 Glenn Orlin,
27 A few areas we did not.

28
29 Councilmember Floreen,
30 Conversations have not taken place.

31
32 Council President Knapp,
33 He didn't want.

34
35 Glenn Orlin,
36 I think, well, the best example is the North County Depot.

37
38 Councilmember Floreen,
39 Yes.

40
41 Glenn Orlin,
42 Which was, which is being recommended by the Executive and it was in the approved
43 CIP as design and land acquisition, but not construction. But there are a few others
44 where it's just design.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Floreen,

Yeah. But mostly we're trying to recognize the real costs of these initiatives. So, but keeping in mind there's that question. Moving on, we're supporting the County Executive on the East Gude Drive, westbound bridge work. And supporting the County Executive's initiative for facility planning bridges although, there is a bridge in there, the Talbot Avenue Bridge in Silver Spring that we deleted from this particular PDF. Although we approved it for modest, some really safety and improvement work in the bridge renovation PDF and the reason for that is because of its intricate relationship with the Purple Line work and we didn't want to rebuild the bridge only to have it taken apart and redone again. But we agree it needs to be renovated to a certain degree. And we found resources to do that within the bridge renovation program, which we, which as I said at the beginning, we added money to to take care of these sorts of things. Moving on, as I mentioned, the Takoma Park has raised issues with respect to bridges in Takoma Park that are owned by the city. We're sympathetic to Takoma Park's concern but we think that there needs to be more conversation there. We were told that those bridges might be eligible for federal aid support depending on the rehabilitation, or replacement approach chosen. The County tells us that they are no worse than a lot of the County bridges. And so we said let the conversation continue on that. There are also revenue sharing issues, I think, sort of tied up with this and we recommended that we keep all the doors open to continue these conversations. But we did not put money in the budget for them at this point. Highway maintenance, Coleville, basically we supported the County Executive's initiatives here. The Brookville Service Park is delayed, there's some split of expenditure issue there but nothing more detailed. And we took out construction management funds for the Coleville Depot because construction is not programmed. North County Maintenance Depot, as I said at the get go, is a new initiative. It was not in the CIP, but the Committee recommends adding it. In the grandest sense it would have three portions, a new ride on depot, fleet services depot to maintain it, and a place for about 90 pieces of heavy duty highway maintenance vehicles and equipment. This is an expensive project. It was in the CIP for design and land acquisition. We discussed this with Glenn and determined that, the fact is that we cannot add a single additional ride on bus to the County's inventory without a place to park them. And this would allow us to get going on that initiative. What we did was to work with staff and to identify an approach that would simply fund the portion of this that would allow for the fleet to be located out there. So we add construction costs, not for the whole depot but for a portion of that. Mr. Gonzalez, did you want to speak to this? You're making hand signals.

Edgar Gonzalez,
On, North, oh.

Councilmember Floreen,
County.



March 11, 2008

1 Edgar Gonzalez,
2 Not just, we do have capacity to increase buses by two.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Two, I take it back. We could have two buses. That's new. I thought there was zero
6 capacity.

7
8 Art Holmes,
9 It's always been two.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 Two, alright. But certainly not to address mobility issues in the northern part of the
13 County. I have a series of questions. Sure. But, so, the proposal is to proceed rather
14 aggressively on this. And let's see here, Glenn, where is the revised PDF on this one?

15
16 Council President Knapp,
17 Circle 28, I think.

18
19 Councilmember Floreen,
20 Is it circle 28 that has the revisions?

21
22 Glenn Orlin,
23 Yes.

24
25 Council President Knapp,
26 Or 29.

27
28 Glenn Orlin,
29 Circle 29.

30
31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 Circle 29 has the Committee recommendation which would, it basically funds the first
33 phase of this project.

34
35 Glenn Orlin,
36 Yeah. Circle 28 shows what the project would be if you built the entire depot within four
37 years.

38
39 Councilmember Floreen,
40 Right.

41
42 Council President Knapp,
43 Okay.



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,
2 Circle 29 is what the Committee is recommending which is to.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 So we pared it down to recognize that we can't afford everything. But if we are
6 committed to mobility, this is the kind of mobility also that I think the, I did ask the
7 Planning Commission what were the kinds of improvements necessary to take
8 Gaithersburg and Germantown out of moratorium under the growth policy? And they did
9 not offer us concrete solutions. But in terms of mobility, they discussed several things as
10 well as increased bus service. And this would allow us to move forward on this issue.
11 So, that's the Committee recommendation.

12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 When, the first question I had was, when this first came up I guess two years ago, not
15 when it first came up two years ago, but when we last discussed it, there was an issue
16 about interaction with the community and what kind of outreach had been done there.
17 And also, if I remember correctly, this is in stage four of Clarksburg which is a Special
18 Protection Area and there are a number of environmental issues that need to be
19 addressed before anything can proceed whether it's County owned or developer built.
20 And so I just want to get a sense of what has been the outreach that has occurred? And
21 then what are the environmental elements that have begun to be laid out there?

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Yeah.

25
26 Council President Knapp,
27 So we know that we have addressed the issues of the Special Protection Area.

28
29 Art Holmes,
30 We have been with the environmental folks at Park and Planning and using the
31 government land there we are okay in the Special Protection Area as far as
32 imperviousness is concerned. We've also had outreach programs. Bruce can probably
33 tell you, I think it's at least two or three with the population and they're satisfied with
34 what we're doing. So we have made an effort to reach out to the public. And we are
35 okay as far as the environmental concern and impervious surfaces in the Special
36 Protection Area.

37
38 Council President Knapp,
39 What about just, even, and I want to get to you Bruce and the outreach, but as far as
40 the staging of Clarksburg, because there are, I didn't think anything was approved to go
41 ahead in that fourth staging area until, for various water quality elements that have been
42 met and a number of other things, so, do we know where they are as it relates to being
43 able to proceed?



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,

2 I think the understanding there was having to do with private development happening
3 not necessarily public facilities, I mean, the jail is in the same area. There are other
4 public facilities. So, it's, I don't think, I could be wrong, but I don't think Mr. Knapp it
5 applies to replacing public facilities. What's happening here is the site is 40-acres, is
6 that right?

7
8 Art Holmes,

9 Yeah.

10
11 Edgar Gonzalez,

12 No. The site is 124-acres.

13
14 Art Holmes,

15 But we're using 40-acres.

16
17 Glenn Orlin,

18 We're using 40-acres of it.

19
20 Edgar Gonzalez,

21 Yeah.

22
23 Glenn Orlin,

24 And what Mr. Holmes was saying about the impervious cap, you may want to explain a
25 little bit more about that because it's basically combining with the corrections center.

26
27 Art Holmes,

28 Combining with the other government land up there, and we talked with, as I said, with
29 the folks at Park and Planning and they're in agreement that we do meet the
30 requirement for the Special Protection Area.

31
32 Bruce Johnston,

33 Right. Basically it's a blending of our site with the jail site over the entire site.

34
35 Art Holmes,

36 Yeah.

37
38 Bruce Johnston,

39 And I believe it's something like in the order of 515-acres that's the County owns in that
40 area. And doing our project, the development that we're looking at, the imperviousness
41 that we're looking at, and considering, well, even not considering a lot of the green roots
42 that we're looking at, we are below the impervious cap in that area. We have
43 concurrence from Park and Planning that that's the correct way to calculate it and so
44 we're proceeding with that.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Council President Knapp,
3 Even with the staging as you've got it laid out we're only funding a portion of this now,
4 right?

5
6 Bruce Johnston,
7 No. Even with the full project we would be under the cap.

8
9 Councilmember Floreen,
10 The full project.

11
12 Bruce Johnston,
13 With the staging.

14
15 Art Holmes,
16 Full project, not just the staging.

17
18 Council President Knapp,
19 Right.

20
21 Edgar Gonzalez,
22 Yeah. And the staging is such that we will do the majority of the earth work at the
23 beginning, that will facilitate the implantation of the next phase in the future. But we're
24 way under, in fact, we had a presentation of the different options and we'll be well
25 under.

26
27 Council President Knapp,
28 Okay. So, Bruce, you talk about the outreach. What have we done in the community?

29
30 Bruce Johnston,
31 Well, following the Council's admonition to have some meetings with the community, we
32 did that within a few months of the discussion. Actually, Edgar kind of headed that first
33 meeting with them. We had relatively light turnout, very little discussion, quite a bit of
34 interest from the few members that were there, we talked about, at that time, about the
35 concept that we were looking at. Again, very little negative feedback on the plan that
36 was proposed. And more recently – has had some meetings with the community and
37 talking about the concept that we're now developing with a relatively low profile building,
38 profile. I think that they're very, very happy with the proposal that we're looking at. I
39 don't know about.

40
41 Council President Knapp,
42 Very, very happy may be a bit overstated.

43
44 Bruce Johnston,



March 11, 2008

1 They're not at all unhappy. Let me put it that way.

2
3 Councilmember Elrich,
4 Thrilled to death.

5
6 Council President Knapp,
7 The other question and then Councilmember Elrich and Councilmember Trachtenberg
8 have some questions, but the Chair indicated that we don't have any capacity as it
9 relates to additional places for buses to increase transit mobility throughout the County.
10 I guess the question I would have is thereby kind of implying that if we were to do a
11 North County Depot, this would facilitate the ability to increase the amount of transit in
12 the Up County.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Correct.

16
17 Council President Knapp,
18 And so, I guess, my question would be, I have not seen or heard any plans from
19 anybody as to kind of additional transit activity from a broader perspective that if we
20 were to do this that it would facilitate increased transit service. So I'd love to get a sense
21 of what we think we would be doing if we were to be able to have that much more
22 additional capacity for buses in the Up County.

23
24 Edgar Gonzalez,
25 That was an analysis actually I asked for two years ago and the Department actually did
26 respond and didn't think to put it in the packet this year. We can dig it out.

27
28 Glenn Orlin,
29 But basically, they have a strategic plan for expanding ride on service over the next 10
30 or 15 years.

31
32 Edgar Gonzalez,
33 Yes.

34
35 Glenn Orlin,
36 And includes, it's actually, the thing I want to say about this depot, although it's in the
37 north County, it's not strictly for additional bus service in the north County. What would
38 happen is, some of the buses that are now assigned to Brookville would be assigned to
39 EMOC and some of the buses, a lot of the buses actually assigned to EMOC would go
40 to north County and so it would allow growth in all parts of the County, the Down
41 County, Mid County, and North County.

42
43 Art Holmes,



March 11, 2008

1 And also we would have some depot facilities that would be relocated up here. So
2 they'd be better in inclement weather, things of that nature, we'd have a better
3 distribution of our depot activities.

4
5 Edgar Gonzalez,

6 Now, the other thing you need to remember is we have the small bus contract that we
7 have about 90 buses that are temporarily stationed at Nicholson and so, once we
8 complete this, we will be able to save all of that lease money that we're paying because
9 we're moving, there will be a reallocation of buses, small buses will go to EMOC, some
10 of the larger buses will go to the north County and – all of that and save the lease
11 money that we're paying today.

12
13 Council President Knapp,

14 So is there, I mean, given the strategic plan, is there a phased in, is there a roll out of, I
15 recognize, kind of part of my question was, I don't, I didn't expect this would be only for
16 service in the UP County, it's to expand capacity throughout the entire system.

17
18 Edgar Gonzalez,

19 Yes.

20
21 Council President Knapp,

22 But all of this stuff is going to be sitting right there and so is there a plan for how quickly
23 we'd begin to increase service for the Up County?

24
25 Glenn Orlin,

26 Well, if this depot was opened on the schedule the Committee is recommending it would
27 be finished in mid or late fiscal year 2011 which means we can begin to add buses to
28 the service and have new service on the ground and running by fiscal year 2012.

29
30 Council President Knapp,

31 Is that part of the plan?

32
33 Glenn Orlin,

34 Well, the plan was, it just says, it doesn't necessarily have it by year, it just says this is
35 how much more service we'd want to be able to provide as areas grow. They haven't
36 been able to do that for the last, you know, few years and they won't for the next, as
37 least the next three years.

38
39 Edgar Gonzalez,

40 When we developed the Go Montgomery Program, we had a roll out, a specific timing of
41 when things were going to happen, we were talking about an additional 144 buses. And
42 we have a schedule. And we had what facilities needed to be there. So we're behind
43 because we didn't get all of the funding.



March 11, 2008

1 Art Holmes,
2 And that's in your program, also.

3
4 Edgar Gonzalez,
5 Yeah.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Well, I guess my point is that you've, you know, this is a big facility, and whether we like
9 it or not it's still the gateway into the Clarksburg community. And so as you come into
10 the Clarksburg community you first get to see a jail and then a maintenance depot. And
11 I recognize they're going to be low profile.

12
13 Art Holmes,
14 Yeah.

15
16 Council President Knapp,
17 But we've also heard that we can proceed with government facilities well in advance of
18 being able to proceed for private development which at times can be more attractive, so
19 we're going to have the jail or the correctional facility and the maintenance depot in
20 likelihood well in advance of anything else on those parcels. So it's not going to be
21 overly attractive. And so to the extent that we can begin to talk to people who are going
22 to be the recipients of this, what do they actually get? I mean, what do they actually see
23 as a benefit in their community as it relates to ridership, Marc train has been a big deal
24 for quite a while, how do we increase ridership there? What are some of the things that
25 we can begin to see as a benefit of having to kind of then be the beneficiary of this
26 depot?

27
28 Art Holmes,
29 Well, you're going to, and maybe this will, may not answer your question, but, right now
30 we're expanding at a rate of about a million and a half to two million folks. There are
31 other folks out there who want to use transit.

32
33 Council President Knapp,
34 Sure.

35
36 Art Holmes,
37 And so, and I can't give you a number, but we won't be passing up folks as we're doing
38 now. So I think it's going to be a plus for the transit system. If you're looking for actual
39 numbers, I can't give those to you. I looked at the, just yesterday I looked at three
40 alternative ways of getting this depot. And they are sensitive to the environment. So I
41 guess that's about all I can say about that.

42
43 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 I guess I would urge to think about, you know, how do you, how to present this to the
2 community in a way, in a part of the County that very much wants to see increased
3 transit utilization because many things are spread out and would love to be able to take
4 full advantage of it. But there isn't great resource there and to be able to at least say,
5 when this comes on line, here are some of the benefits that you'll be able to see shortly
6 thereafter which will enhance the County as a whole. But also, you who have to be the
7 place where this is going to land, here's what you're going to see and here is why this is
8 going to be a plus. I think that would be helpful to be able to present that to the
9 community.

10
11 Art Holmes,
12 We well, before we, and there's any selection of a particular model, we will take that
13 back to the community. And the community will see that. As I said, the first time I've
14 seen any alternatives was yesterday.

15
16 Council President Knapp,
17 Right. Councilmember Elrich.

18
19 Councilmember Elrich,
20 I think I'm sort of dovetailing on where you were but I was looking further ahead and I
21 think I saw something like a plan to buy 28 buses.

22
23 Art Holmes,
24 In this budget?

25
26 Glenn Orlin,
27 That was.

28
29 Art Holmes,
30 These are replacement buses.

31
32 Glenn Orlin,
33 No, no, no, no, that's a different.

34
35 Councilmember Elrich,
36 No, that's the expansion.

37
38 Glenn Orlin,
39 No, what happened was, and this is, it's more complicated. I had recommended a
40 project called ride on fleet expansion.

41
42 Art Holmes,
43 Oh, okay.



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,

2 Which would be paid for out of impact tax funds and that was about \$14 million, which, if
3 you assume about a half million dollars a bus with the newer buses we'd be getting,
4 maybe that's a little too high, but it'd be about 28, maybe 30 buses.

5
6 Art Holmes,
7 Okay.

8
9 Glenn Orlin,

10 For expansion purposes. And it was timed actually to go with this terminal so we could
11 actually start buying buses so they could be available by fiscal year '12. Typically
12 though, we buy buses, whether they're replacement or new ones out of the operating
13 budget, so this is really a way to sort of guarantee that there would be the money in the
14 operating budgets or in the budget for new buses. Unfortunately, over the weekend or
15 actually after the packet came out, this is the addendum number two, I was wrong and
16 misunderstood information that I had gotten from OMB and from Finance about how
17 much additional impact tax funds was available. It's really, we have actually not \$40
18 million more, it's really more like 22 and a half million dollars more. So we would have
19 to, to get to the same level of bonding, we would have to cut about \$18 million. And one
20 of the things I am recommending, which the Committee has not had a chance to vote
21 on, I'm hoping they do that before we actually get to it, is to take that project out. And so
22 we wouldn't have that \$14 million in impact taxes for ride on fleet expansion. We'd just,
23 you know, maybe try it again next year or when we get to the year that we would be
24 expanding, make sure we have the money for the operating budget. And there are a
25 couple other changes to addendum two, but that's the main one.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,

28 I guess what's missing in my mind, and it sounds like it somewhat what Mike was
29 questioning is, what is the plan? I mean, if there's a plan for expanding ride on service,
30 how many buses do you need to do that to get to where we want to go?

31
32 Art Holmes,

33 Well, I'm trying to, I don't remember how many. As I said, the plan was 144 additional
34 buses.

35
36 Councilmember Elrich,
37 Right.

38
39 Art Holmes,

40 And I just can't remember how many we have done so far. And you'd have to take in
41 production lead times.

42
43 Councilmember Elrich,
44 Right.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Art Holmes,
3 To make sure that those things would jive. I can get you how many we've gotten, but I
4 just don't remember that number.

5
6 Glenn Orlin,
7 And that was also a ten-year plan that was approved in 2002. So the idea was by 2012.

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 Right.

11
12 Glenn Orlin,
13 There would be 144, well, you know, now we're only a few years away from that, plus
14 we've had this period, we haven't really been able to expand because of the lack of
15 terminal space or depot space.

16
17 Councilmember Elrich,
18 So, where are we on the 144? Do we have?

19
20 Glenn Orlin,
21 I don't remember either.

22
23 Councilmember Elrich,
24 20, 30?

25
26 Glenn Orlin,
27 We've added.

28
29 Art Holmes,
30 I'll get you that number. I don't remember.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,
33 It's an operating budget, typically more of an operating budget kind conversation.

34
35 Councilmember Elrich,
36 But here we are talking about expanding a depot and the benefits of not only this, the
37 capacity it gives us in the Up County, but by freeing up capacity in the rest of the
38 County, but if we don't buy any buses and we don't buy enough buses, then basically,
39 we're creating capacity without any plan to utilize the capacity.

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,
42 Let me just.

43
44 Glenn Orlin,



March 11, 2008

1 That's usually done in the operating budget.

2
3 Councilmember Floreen,

4 Let me just interject, that this is one of the challenges with these initiatives, but you can't
5 even have that conversation unless you have a place to put them and to expand the
6 fleet. And we send these signals on a variety of levels. If we don't fund this or delay it, it
7 will just be so much later that we have the ability to expand ride on service, you know.

8
9 Councilmember Elrich,

10 I guess I'm just, I'm uncomfortable with the disconnect between the addition of buses
11 and the plan to expand capacity. It's okay to say that's in the operating budget. But what
12 has been in the operating budget and, I mean, I guess, in a week, we'll know it's going
13 to be in the operating budget but one way or the other we need to address.

14
15 Glenn Orlin,

16 It won't be in this operating budget. Because there is the FY09 operating budget and so,
17 they're not going to recommend adding any buses unless it's two.

18
19 Councilmember Elrich,

20 Okay.

21
22 Glenn Orlin,

23 But by fiscal year '11 is when you could add money to the operating budget. In fact,
24 remember, when you buy buses in a budget like FY11, they're not delivered for a year
25 later.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,

28 Right.

29
30 Glenn Orlin,

31 So, they're not going to be ready for FY12. But that is the year when this would be a
32 critical issue. It would have been nice to be able to carve out CIP space for this. We
33 tried this actually four years ago and because, and it was approved by the Council, but
34 then impact tax revenues plummeted and it fell off. Yet we, you know, we still have, you
35 know, periodically bought additional buses for the fleet when expansions have to
36 happen. Do you remember?

37
38 Art Holmes,

39 I remember Glenn, the total number when we were talking was something like a 600
40 bus fleet. And we were going to do in the ten-year plan 144 buses. I will have to get you
41 how many we've bought so far. But it's not a heck of a lot.

42
43 Councilmember Elrich,

44 I'm getting that impression.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Floreen,
3 Yeah.

4
5 Glenn Orlin,
6 We have a.

7
8 Councilmember Elrich,
9 I said I'm getting that impression. But then how do you expand non-auto transit if you
10 don't provide any additional non-auto transit? It seems it'd be rather difficult to achieve
11 that objective.

12
13 Art Holmes,
14 I'm not following your question.

15
16 Councilmember Elrich,
17 I guess, you know, part of what we're trying to do is provide capacity for people other
18 than drive, which means drastically improving ride on service. But you can't do that
19 without vehicles. So we have got one limitation which is the lack of space but I don't see
20 any plan here. I mean, if we're relying on, for example, you said the impact fees, well, if
21 you're going to have the amount of money and then, you know, I'm going to have 28
22 buses to 14 buses, I'm really having a hard time picturing any kind of meaningful
23 expansion of transportation services based around 14 buses or 15 buses.

24
25 Glenn Orlin,
26 But what you're asking for Mr. Elrich is not just the new buses. You're asking where are
27 the drivers, where are the mechanics, where's the fuel, which is a lot of money. And all
28 that is funded out of the operating budget. And, yes, we do have a 6-year public
29 services program, that's the, forecast what the budget is going to be, but the only thing
30 the Council has really paid attention to ever, whether this is right or not, when you get to
31 the operating budget, is next year, FY09. And next year there's not the opportunity,
32 except for two, to add additional buses, should that be, we don't know if that's, doubt if
33 that, that's not going to be in Mr. Leggett's budget in a couple of days. But when they do
34 that, you have to add money for fuel and you have to add money for.

35
36 Councilmember Elrich,
37 Right.

38
39 Glenn Orlin,
40 Drivers and mechanics.

41
42 Councilmember Elrich,
43 But would you argue that we should only use the impact fees to add buses or would it.



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,
2 No.

3
4 Councilmember Elrich,
5 Putting expansion be in the capital budget be appropriate using GO bonds?

6
7 Glenn Orlin,
8 No, it wouldn't be appropriate for GO bonds because, well, it might be on the edge of it.

9
10 Councilmember Floreen,
11 Twenty-year.

12
13 Councilmember Elrich,
14 The lifecycle.

15
16 Glenn Orlin,
17 GO bonds are usually 20-year bonds. Now we have a rule which we followed for the last
18 decade or more where a certain portion of the CIP, no more than 10 percent of it can be
19 for assets which would last between 12 and 20 years. Because, on average the portfolio
20 of bonds that we issue are for projects which last way longer than 20 years. And so we
21 do things like resurfacing of primary arterial roads, for example, with bonds because
22 that lasts, you know, 14 years or so. And the proposal in the Executive's CIP for
23 resurfacing which we're about to get to does the same thing for residential streets. And
24 so you could make an argument on the edge about, and it really is on the edge, about
25 buses because buses have about a 12-year life. But typically, in fact, we've never
26 bought buses with bonds. We've always bought them with current revenue of one sort of
27 another. And impact tax is a form of current revenue. And it is a legitimate, it's right
28 there in the law.

29
30 Councilmember Elrich,
31 Yeah.

32
33 Glenn Orlin,
34 One of the things you can use impact taxes for is for buying buses which expand the
35 size of the fleet.

36
37 Councilmember Elrich,
38 I guess I'm just frustrated because, I mean, the number that you're talking about is not
39 enough to greatly enhance the transit system. And on the one hand to say that that's
40 what we want to do and, in fact, for environmental reasons that's what we're going to
41 have to do, but then not have the capacity either to put them or the financial capacity to
42 buy them is a problem. I think we need to think about more comprehensively what we're
43 doing.



March 11, 2008

1 Glenn Orlin,
2 And we have time to figure that out because we can't get newer buses out there until
3 fiscal year '12.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,
6 Yeah.

7
8 Glenn Orlin,
9 Because there's no place to put them.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 Keep in mind that this does propose housing for 250.

13
14 Art Holmes,
15 Yeah.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 Up to 250 buses and you've got to.

19
20 Art Holmes,
21 The first increment would be 150 buses.

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Yeah.

25
26 Art Holmes,
27 Then 250, a total of 250. You've got to start somewhere.

28
29 Councilmember Floreen,
30 Yeah.

31
32 Edgar Gonzalez,
33 Yeah. And by adopting the proposal that the Committee has recommended, we will be
34 able to expand very rapidly up to 60 buses, you know, because, and that is going to
35 take a while because the major cost on this is not the bus. The major cost is the
36 operating funds for the drivers, the mechanics, and the gas. You know, it's all of those
37 operating costs. And those are part of the operating budget. So without the depot being
38 built, we cannot even have this conversation.

39
40 Councilmember Elrich,
41 I'd appreciate if, and not today, but if you could get me a little more in depth analysis of
42 what takes to add a bus in terms of all the associated costs with it so, you know, I want
43 to start thinking about.



March 11, 2008

1 Edgar Gonzalez,
2 Sure. We have that readily available.

3
4 Councilmember Elrich,
5 What it would take to get--.

6
7 Edgar Gonzalez,
8 We have that readily available.

9
10 Councilmember Elrich,
11 Thank you.

12
13 Edgar Gonzalez,
14 \$200,000 a bus roughly to operate it, \$200,000.

15
16 Bill Silby,
17 For every bus you add, Bill Silby, Transit Services, for every bus you add, I've done
18 some quick analysis, it's somewhere around \$200,000 a year in operating costs.

19
20 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
21 I very much appreciate the issues, concerns that were raised by President Knapp and
22 Councilmember Elrich and I have a series of a few questions. Again, I haven't had the
23 benefit of sitting through all of the T&E worksessions although I've listened to some.
24 Have park and ride lots been studied for a dual use for storage and function as depots?
25 Is that something that's been done in the past? I'm assuming so.

26
27 Edgar Gonzalez,
28 Park and ride uses, yes, we have had an extensive park and ride facility kind of program
29 and it has been very difficult to find sites that are attractive to commuters and that are
30 large enough to, so that we can provide transit service that is efficient and effective.
31 This specific location where we're proposing this depot was considered as one of the
32 possibilities for a park and ride facility. But when, and this is part of the discussion that
33 we had with the community, Mr. Knapp, one of the problems that we heard is why is
34 everything coming to Clarksburg. And when we showed them all of the efforts and the
35 extensive studies that we did to find a site, they realize that it wasn't easy and that this
36 was the only site available where we could put this facility in all of the County.

37
38 Art Holmes,
39 And another factor is it would be very inefficient to have a parking place for buses and
40 some distance away to have the support element for the buses. With a depot you have
41 the support element and you have the buses parked there and you have the facilities for
42 the drivers. So, otherwise, you are going to have to move from three different places,
43 one for the driver, one for your maintenance, and then one for your storage, plus you're



March 11, 2008

1 going to have some dead head time as far as getting buses back and forth. So we think
2 this is the most economical way to do it.

3
4 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

5 Right. And I'm not disputing that. But it's very clear to me that in order to build capacity,
6 we're going to have to have more than one response to that so I'm just looking to see if
7 this was something that we've explored and if it would be a possibility beyond the North
8 County location. I'm not suggesting that it's a substitute but I wanted to get some sense
9 if it had been evaluated.

10
11 Edgar Gonzalez,

12 Yes. We have looked at many locations. For a park and ride facility to be useful it
13 requires visibility, number one, close access and easy access from a major road. I
14 mean, you take a look at the park and ride facility that we have at Norbeck and Georgia
15 Avenue, that the state has. It has capacity for about 300 vehicles. And if we get more
16 than 25 on any given day, that's 25 too many. We have another facility, or the state has
17 another facility right at Clopper, the interchange of Clopper and I-270. There are two.
18 But the one that has access from Clopper has capacity for about 300. And if we get ten
19 people, that's ten too many because it's very inconvenient. Whereas the one at 124 and
20 I-270 is much more heavily used. So we look, we have looked at facilities in the
21 Clarksburg area where the transit center is going to be, that's one. But it doesn't have
22 good visibility so it's not as attractive. I mean, we have to, we have been even dealing
23 with churches to be able to provide park and ride facilities to communities and we, you
24 know, we pay them a fee. But we have done this and we continue, the state also has a
25 comprehensive program to look at park and ride facilities. Our transit services provide
26 service from Frederick because we don't have the, you know, land and the
27 acquiescence of the general public to have facilities of this type in parts of Montgomery
28 County. But we do that.

29
30 Art Holmes,

31 Your office I think Mr. Knapp has asked us for some figures and we don't that data, but
32 we'll get you some data along that line.

33
34 Council President Knapp,

35 Okay.

36
37 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

38 Another question, building on, again, my interest in having more than one option down
39 the road, what are we doing to build additional capacity through space-efficient
40 approaches to the existing bus facilities that we have? And I'm thinking in terms of the
41 Brookville Service Park.

42
43 Art Holmes,

44 Brookville is at maximum.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

No, that I know. But, you know, it just seemed to me that no matter what we do with the North County location at some point if we're really serious about building ridership on mass transit and increasing bus use, we're going to have to have more than that one project. And I would agree with some of the concerns that have been raised about the long-range planning, but also about putting everything up in one area. I'm just looking to see how we distribute it all.

Art Holmes,

I don't think that we're.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

This effort we're making.

Art Holmes,

We're not trying to put everything in one area. As you look at the transit plan, it called for 600 buses. If we get the North County Depot with the 250 buses, we can meet that particular schedule.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

Okay.

Edgar Gonzalez,

And we're not putting all of our eggs on ride on buses.

Art Holmes,

No.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

But I'm asking what you're doing not to put them all.

Art Holmes,

Oh.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

And I think you're misunderstanding.

Art Holmes,

Okay. Maybe I am, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Trachtenberg,

The manner in which I'm asking the question.



March 11, 2008

1 Edgar Gonzalez,
2 Yes.

3
4 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
5 I'm saying, what are we doing to build capacity in other locations?

6
7 Edgar Gonzalez,
8 Okay.

9
10 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
11 That's a very valid question in the context of the conversation.

12
13 Edgar Gonzalez,
14 Okay. And here is where the major transit systems that are being planned by the
15 Corridor City Transit Way and the Purple Line come into play. Once these facilities are
16 implemented, the way we provide transit service with our buses is going to change
17 because we'll be now, we'll be coming in some areas more of a feeder to these other
18 elements that are the major transit systems that we expect. All of that is part of our
19 strategic plan. So maybe at one time what we need to do is come to you and give you a
20 briefing on the strategic plan that we have for transit. But he had the BRT on Veirs Mill
21 Road.

22
23 Art Holmes,
24 Yeah. That bus route.

25
26 Edgar Gonzalez,
27 We had the BRT that is supposed to come down Georgia Avenue. So all of that is part
28 of our comprehensive strategic plan for transit. And then on top of that, we have this bus
29 component. We have also our park and ride facility. We have our TMB's. We have our
30 van pool and carpool programs. All of that is part of it but right now we're just focusing
31 on this one facility that will allow us to expand our service to this one component. But
32 this is not the only component of our strategic plan. And I think we can arrange for a
33 briefing to the.

34
35 Art Holmes,
36 Yep.

37
38 Edgar Gonzalez,
39 T&E Committee or the full Council at your convenience. We'll be glad to do that.

40
41 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
42 I think that would be helpful.

43
44 Edgar Gonzalez,



March 11, 2008

1 Yeah. You will see that this is just one part.

2
3 Art Holmes,
4 This is one element of it.

5
6 Edgar Gonzalez,
7 Yeah.

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 Of the transit system.

11
12 Edgar Gonzalez,
13 Yeah.

14
15 Council President Knapp,
16 Council Vice-President Andrews.

17
18 Councilmember Andrews,
19 Thank you. Well, I agree that we need the North County Maintenance Depot. We need
20 the capacity. You mentioned Edgar that different usage that you've seen -- connected
21 but not directly related issue on the park and ride lots. Whereas the one that's right on
22 124 off 270, coming south, easy to get to, it's well used and the one that's at Clopper
23 and Diamond really, where it's easy to get to going north on 270 rather than south. It's
24 hard to get to it coming south on 270.

25
26 Art Holmes,
27 Right.

28
29 Councilmember Andrews,
30 It takes longer. What do you think can be done about that? Or is there, I mean, is there
31 any hope of attracting traffic from the west to that park and ride lot that is coming east
32 on Clopper or is it simply not going to be a successful location given that it seems that
33 the people that are using the ride on lots are the ones coming south on 270 and not
34 from primarily the other directions?

35
36 Edgar Gonzalez,
37 Yeah. We have been working with the state on this issue. And one of the things that we
38 are considering is having a different entrance into the lot. It's going to be expensive. But
39 it's probably worth it. You have a facility that will help. And, you know, we'll have to
40 spend some money. But it will improve access. Because it's not only the southbound
41 traffic. This park and ride facilities also serve for people to get to there for carpool.

42
43 Art Holmes,
44 Right.



March 11, 2008

Edgar Gonzalez,

Similar to the slug lines that they have in Virginia. We don't have as many of those but that is also one of the purposes that we are trying do and that will serve only the people that are coming from southbound 270 but some of the local people in our neighborhoods, in our County, that can get together at a convenient and safe place and then take the carpool lanes.

Art Holmes,

And because we really need it, we are really pushing the park and ride system at Norbeck Road and Georgia and we hope that the propensity will be to use that after they, we're doing this because of the construction that is going to go on at Fenmont. But we certainly try to get people to use the park and ride.

Councilmember Andrews,

It's important to figure out how, what strategy will be successful to using because it's sitting there, you know, essentially unused right now, the one at Diamond.

Edgar Gonzalez,

Yeah. Yeah. And then, again, our bus service part of it is to provide more frequent service so that we can take people to Metro or other destinations.

Council President Knapp,
Councilmember Berliner.

Councilmember Berliner,

Thank you Council President. I just want to say that I have found it to be a source of great embarrassment that we're in a situation where we can't add ride on buses because we don't have a depot for them. From my perspective, the sooner the better. When I look at these numbers, Council President, in terms of the cost benefit ratio of waiting a year or two to get the second hundred buses in and we're saving something on the order of \$17 million as I read this by staging it, and we're losing having 100 buses out of a total of 250. So I question whether or not it's an appropriate time to be staging this whether or not we wouldn't get the capacity that the Council President is looking for to serve his community as well as the larger community by doing the whole thing at once.

Glenn Orlin,

The issue is, if I can answer that, the issue is, again, fiscal capacity to be able to do it. There is only so many buses you can add to the system at once that you can afford to do, not just because of buying the buses, because also the \$200,000 a year to operate that bus.

Councilmember Berliner,



March 11, 2008

1 Yes.

2
3 Glenn Orlin,

4 For every year that operating it. I mean, just in some quick math, I mean, if you bought
5 all 150 buses in the first year, in FY11 that's, at \$500,000 a bus, is, what is that \$75
6 million and then adding \$200,000 a bus on top of that is another \$30 million, so it's \$105
7 million you're adding to the FY11 operating budget. Do you want to do that? I don't think
8 so. So you want to be able to add buses steadily. But there's also a problem with how
9 many bus drivers and mechanics they can hire at one time.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,

12 Yeah.

13
14 Glenn Orlin,

15 There was a period of time not too long ago that they couldn't even hire enough drivers
16 for the system they had. We had to have a lot of people do a lot of overtime, right Bill?
17 And so you want to have an aggressive program but I think having 150 for a few years
18 and being able to easily add another 100 maybe five or six years later is probably.

19
20 Councilmember Berliner,

21 Am I reading this correctly that the County Executive did not propose these dollars to
22 begin with?

23
24 Glenn Orlin,

25 That is correct. Typically the, in the, throughout the CIP, what often happened was the
26 Executive recommended enough money to keep the project going at the stage that it's
27 in. In other words, the design, completing design and the case of land acquisition. But
28 since construction wasn't going to start in FY09, he didn't recommend it because he's
29 trying to keep the entire CIP within a certain level. The reason why I recommended
30 actually moving forward on it was because I knew that the production schedule was
31 such that they could actually start construction in fiscal year '10 and I was worried that if
32 we waited until an amendment next year, trying to put a lot of money in the first year,
33 essentially the first year of that amendment period was not going to be tenable and that
34 would really then delay the ability to deliver this depot. And then when the idea emerged
35 that you could actually stage this so that you in fact don't build a highway maintenance
36 part of it first, you build just the part of the transit first, and that not only could you build it
37 somewhat cheaper within the 6-year period, but also accelerate when the transit could
38 come online by a year or even a year and a half sounded good. So that's kind of where
39 we got to where we got.

40
41 Councilmember Floreen,

42 And let me just interject that the County Executive had included four and a half million
43 for construction management costs during this period. But they simply had not



March 11, 2008

1 programmed the construction. Again, going back to our never-ending conversation
2 about construction dollars.

3
4 Councilmember Berliner,
5 So, I just want to indicate my support then for the Committee's recommendation go
6 forward.

7
8 Council President Knapp,
9 Councilmember Elrich.

10
11 Councilmember Elrich,
12 How do you have a strategic plan for bus rapid transit and no money for bus rapid
13 transit?

14
15 Art Holmes,
16 We have a strategic plan, we have a plan that we were trying to get the state to buy but
17 we have never got the state to agree.

18
19 Councilmember Elrich,
20 Right.

21
22 Art Holmes,
23 With us with the bus rapid transit system on Veers Mill Road. And I've written several
24 letters to the former Secretary of Transportation. And we were never, we never got any
25 takers on that but we do have a rudimentary plan for a bus rapid transit system there.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,
28 I've seen the rudimentary plan and frankly, it's not much of a bus rapid transit system,
29 one with the occasional queue jumper.

30
31 Art Holmes,
32 Yes.

33
34 Councilmember Elrich,
35 It's not what anybody would call a real bus rapid transit, it's just queue jumpers to speed
36 up conventional buses running on regular roadways.

37
38 Art Holmes,
39 That's right.

40
41 Councilmember Elrich,
42 Okay. I mean, I just, again, fail to see any kind of comprehensive transit plan, any kind
43 of plan that emphasizes transit at all. I mean, this County can spend \$70 million on
44 Montrose Parkway West despite the fact the state had not a dime for that project, but



March 11, 2008

1 we can't move any kind of bus rapid transit program forward until the state is ready?
2 There's nothing in this budget to do anything like that? I mean, I don't understand how.

3
4 Art Holmes,

5 These plans that you're talking about sir, are in the master plan. And we are, as we get
6 funds, as we get resources, we can do those particular plans. The Georgia Avenue plan
7 that Edgar talked about, we can do those. So, there is a plan and we indicated that we
8 would come back and talk to you about that particular plan but I disagree with you that
9 there is no plan.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 Okay.

13
14 Council President Knapp,

15 Okay, I just want to conclude and, I'm not supportive of a depot. I know we've got to do
16 it. I know we've got to get there. My concern is, especially looking at a community that
17 for the last four years has felt somewhat maligned, some of which the County has
18 contributed to, some of which we haven't, but starting with the mid 90s, we had a
19 debate about a correctional facility and it came through. And fortunately the correctional
20 facility has been a great neighbor. The Department of Corrections and the Director have
21 done a great job of doing outreach to the community to the extent that a correctional
22 facility can be a great neighbor, it is. I know there's a lot of community activities that are
23 handled there and they really work well together. The next big thing that is going to work
24 that the County is going to do up there is going to be a maintenance depot. Given the
25 other issues of the last three and a half years, with all due respect, it doesn't look like
26 we're doing a lot of great things for Clarksburg. We're trying to get some of the boats
27 turned around. So, I guess my question is, and I would like to, given the broader
28 strategic plan, but to be able to sit down with you guys over the coming weeks, months,
29 we're all going to be in Clarksburg for a town hall meeting on Wednesday and I'm pretty
30 sure we're going to get some feedback from folks as to whether or not they think this is
31 a good idea at that, but what is the benefit to the community? What is the Department
32 working on as we begin to move into Clarksburg to figure out how we do this both from
33 an access to facilities to a transit perspective to whatever, because if we do a phase-in
34 approach and we put in 150 buses and there isn't, none of that actually provides service
35 to that community, what else, what do they, I mean, sure, they can all feel good about
36 and magnanimous about helping the entire County and the greater good but that still
37 doesn't do much for them as an emerging community. So what are the things that we
38 can begin to take into account and begin to look at to make sure that as the beneficiary
39 of these lovely projects that they actually see some real benefit to the greater
40 community?

41
42 Art Holmes,

43 I think Edgar, in talking about some of those, you know, you have a couple of, well, two
44 major things. We want to get the North Depot at some particular time. There's also the



March 11, 2008

1 Corridor Cities Transit Way. I don't know where you go further than that right now with
2 what is in our master plans.

3
4 Edgar Gonzalez,
5 We have looked specifically at expansion, well, at the creation of lines communicating
6 Clarksburg, connecting Clarksburg to the Boyds Station for example.

7
8 Council President Knapp,
9 Right. I know.

10
11 Edgar Gonzalez,
12 This is one of the projects that, Boyd was going to be closed, you remember. We, you
13 undertook some efforts and we kept that project going.

14
15 Council President Knapp,
16 Guys. Guys. Thank you.

17
18 Edgar Gonzalez,
19 And so we have specific.

20
21 Council President Knapp,
22 Guys. If we're going to talk, okay.

23
24 Edgar Gonzalez,
25 We have specific plans for lines connecting Clarksburg, the town center and that
26 general area to Boyds, to Germantown. Now, in Germantown we have exhibited the
27 largest increase in ridership. So it's not only Clarksburg. It's also Germantown.

28
29 Council President Knapp,
30 Right.

31
32 Edgar Gonzalez,
33 We're passing people waiting for a bus because we're full.

34
35 Council President Knapp,
36 No, I know we are and I know we've had those conversations. What I'm saying is, I want
37 to make sure that as a part of getting this done.

38
39 Edgar Gonzalez,
40 Absolutely.

41
42 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 As a part of opening this up in 2011 or 2012 that there's a clear strategy that if I'm sitting
2 in Clarksburg I say, oh, I'm not thrilled with that but as a result of this I can now get to
3 the Marc Station. I can now get to – Center in Germantown.

4
5 Edgar Gonzalez,
6 Yes. Right.

7
8 Council President Knapp,
9 In a way that right now does not occur.

10
11 Glenn Orlin,
12 Right.

13
14 Council President Knapp,
15 And so I just want that to be thought through.

16
17 Edgar Gonzalez,
18 Yeah.

19
20 Glenn Orlin,
21 Here's a real practical thing.

22
23 Edgar Gonzalez,
24 These are things that we have already discussed.

25
26 Glenn Orlin,
27 Here's a real practical argument that I think the folks in Clarksburg will understand.
28 Route 75 was almost eliminated. And route 75 was almost eliminated because its cost
29 effectiveness was very, very poor.

30
31 Council President Knapp,
32 That's right.

33
34 Glenn Orlin,
35 And one of the reasons why it's very, very poor is because unfortunately, because
36 Clarksburg is still growing. There's still not enough density there to support a lot of
37 transit service. Yet we want to provide the transit service ahead of time to try to develop
38 the habit, if you will, of taking transit.

39
40 Council President Knapp,
41 Yep.

42
43 Glenn Orlin,



March 11, 2008

1 Yet, it's always going to be subject to this kind of possible cutting because of its lack of
2 cost effectiveness. By putting a depot up there it means your dead head time is reduced
3 considerably which increases automatically the cost effectiveness of the route. So, I
4 mean, that's sort of a detail, and it doesn't necessarily guarantee that these routes are
5 suddenly going to be, you know, safe from possible future cuts but it does improve their
6 cost effectiveness pretty significantly.

7
8 Council President Knapp,
9 I know. And those, but those are the types of things, because I think we've got to think
10 about what we present to the community at the end of the day.

11
12 Art Holmes,
13 Yes.

14
15 Council President Knapp,
16 And that, I think is going to be an important element. So.

17
18 Councilmember Floreen,
19 Well, and, as I said earlier, some time ago actually, we did ask Park and Planning what
20 would be necessary to bring Gaithersburg and Germantown out of moratorium and
21 transit accessibility is a key to that.

22
23 Council President Knapp,
24 I agree.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,
27 Under our rules.

28
29 Council President Knapp,
30 I just want to make sure we actually get some.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,
33 Well, you got to get started folks. You got to have a place to put them.

34
35 Council President Knapp,
36 The other thing I would just note is this is kind of another example of us putting the
37 money in that one would think if it was ready for construction in 2010 that would have
38 been coming in from across the street when we started and considered this. So I
39 appreciate the T&E Committee looking at this with a more far sided reach and
40 appreciate that and while I may not be thrilled with the fact that this is where it has to be
41 located I think that we do need to address it for our transit services.

42
43 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 Okay. Alright. Next thing, resurfacing, and rural and residential road rehabilitation.
2 Source of many, constituent concern to all of us, in the next two pages you will see
3 Glenn's point that we don't disagree with that there's not enough money in the budget to
4 fund all the things we should fund. We agree but we go with the County Executive's
5 recommendation here. The County Executive has backed off, this County Executive has
6 backed off the previous County Executive's approach which was to put down the, to
7 eliminate the micropave program that some communities were very unhappy with. The
8 benefit of that of course is that you could address more communities at the same price.
9 But it generated community concerns, so now we're going back to the old way, which is
10 the more expensive solution where you solve fewer problems in terms of the quality of
11 the roadway for the same amount of money. But the residents are more comfortable
12 with that approach. That's what the County Executive proposes and the Committee
13 agrees. Glenn thinks we should spend more.

14
15 Glenn Orlin,
16 I was torn on this one.

17
18 Councilmember Floreen,
19 And you're right.

20
21 Glenn Orlin,
22 I was torn on this one.

23
24 Councilmember Floreen,
25 So anyways, next item is sidewalk and infrastructure revitalization. The list of the
26 communities who are being served with this project now and estimated for the future are
27 on page 12. This is the program of replacing damaged sidewalks, curbs and gutters,
28 and the like. The Committee recommendation also is to support the County Executive.
29 Some of us would have preferred to pump more money into this, but again, it's a
30 question of how much we can afford and when we can afford to spend it. So that's
31 where we are. Yes.

32
33 Council President Knapp,
34 Quick question on actually both of these issues.

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 If we had more money, we could make more people happy.

38
39 Council President Knapp,
40 No, this isn't even about money, this is just about communicating. I know that there is
41 kind of queue that we follow to try and, you know, what neighborhood's next, what roads
42 are next, and we appreciate, we've sent messages over and we've gotten responses
43 back and worked with communities so they understand where they are in the queue.



March 11, 2008

1 One of things, and this is kind of a damned if you do, damned if you don't scenario, but
2 it's something to look at.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 So true.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Which is, to make kind of that queue more accessible so that people can get a sense of
9 where they are. Because in the absence of any information, people just kind of think
10 they're adrift and don't know where they kind of land. And it's something, and we've kind
11 of talked about it in my office for quite a few times that if it was just something that was
12 there, and the thing that brought it to mind is, if you look on page 12, you've got the
13 sidewalk and infrastructure revitalization where you walk through kind of the areas
14 you're going to address in that, and as it relates to the resurfacing projects it may make
15 sense to do something similar, it's just available on your website that's something that
16 people can look at and if they have more specific questions, it just gives people a sense
17 that it may be four years but at least I know somebody is thinking about us. Okay.

18
19 Councilmember Floreen,
20 Some of these projects I will say do morph into larger projects. I believe once the
21 County gets into them and sometimes they become different projects once the extent of
22 the infrastructure challenge is revealed, often drainage issues and other kinds of things
23 that will get communities very interested.

24
25 Council President Knapp,
26 Councilmember Elrich has a question.

27
28 Councilmember Elrich,
29 Yeah, my other concern about this is that, at least on the resurfacing part of this, is that
30 the long, long list and timeframe means that these projects will deteriorate and that
31 things that we have in one category are going to wind up being treated in another
32 category. So this is not accurate. Things that are, you know, that are \$74,000 a lane
33 mile, if we don't get to them for ten years they're going to be \$270,000 a lane mile. And
34 so there's, I think we need to think of, I mean, obviously the budget constraints are what
35 they are, but we're also making choices within this budget of what we're going to do and
36 what we're not going to do. I think this bears some serious thinking about. Forty-five
37 years is a bit too long to be rehabilitating the roads.

38
39 Art Holmes,
40 [INAUDIBLE]. There has been a very detailed study and [INAUDIBLE] given to the T&E
41 Committee where we have looked at this and looked at it terms of what we can do and
42 when we can do it.

43
44 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Right.

2
3 Art Holmes,

4 And we'd be very happy to come to your office and give you that particular briefing.

5
6 Councilmember Elrich,

7 And we.

8
9 Art Holmes,

10 It's not something that we are just, we know that it's going to take 45 years. What we've
11 done before is going to be in a very bad condition. So that is not our program. And we'll
12 do the program as we get some resources to do it. And we'll try to do it in the smartest
13 way possible.

14
15 Councilmember Elrich,

16 I was going to say, we did a similar analysis in the city of Takoma Parks sometime ago
17 and we discovered that it was cheaper to borrow money and fix everything than it was
18 to pay the inflation costs on road construction. I mean, everybody was like don't borrow
19 because, you know, you're going to pay interest. The interest paled in comparison to the
20 inflated road construction costs and the changing nature of the road construction.

21
22 Art Holmes,

23 Let us come to you and give you that briefing. I think you'll understand that there is a
24 methodology behind what we have done.

25
26 Councilmember Elrich,

27 Okay.

28
29 Glenn Orlin,

30 In this case what the Committee.

31
32 Councilmember Floreen,

33 Yeah. There's an elaborate system. It's still not enough and everyone agrees.

34
35 Glenn Orlin,

36 The Executive's recommendations, if you look at these two PDF's together, is about \$65
37 million within the six-year period, compared to \$19 million last time.

38
39 Councilmember Floreen,

40 Yeah.

41
42 Glenn Orlin,

43 So, it's, you know, it's tripling, more than tripling and it's mostly in bond funded revenue.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Elrich,

2 But if you're doing that, I mean, for example, if you're using the hot asphalt mix which is
3 what multiples of the other and you're not really quite getting the multiplier, in other
4 words, to say we're spending this much more but in reality you're spending this much
5 more on something which costs a lot more. You're having less expansion of the miles
6 than apparent by the expansion of the costs.

7
8 Glenn Orlin,

9 On the other hand, the new system, the new way of doing it lasts twice as long. So the
10 life cycle costs are.

11
12 Councilmember Elrich,
13 I think it's good.

14
15 Glenn Orlin,
16 It's still, it's a mixed bag.

17
18 Councilmember Floreen,
19 Yeah. You're right.

20
21 Council President Knapp,
22 Councilmember Berliner.

23
24 Councilmember Berliner,
25 Thank you Council President. I apologize that I was out of the room during our
26 discussion with respect to the resurfacing. I just wanted to commend General Holmes
27 and the Executive as well as the Committee for taking the decision it did with respect to
28 the micropave. It is something that my community in particular has been complaining
29 bitterly about. I understand that. But actually the good people of Rollingwood would
30 often cite that as one of the reasons why there should be incorporation because they
31 would do it better. So I think it has been a source of a sore subject for many of our
32 citizens and they feel like they're paying taxes and if they're going to pay their taxes,
33 they at least want the quality that goes with it and the micropaving was not getting it
34 done.

35
36 Art Holmes,
37 It was a least cost method of doing some things and getting a number of miles done.
38 And it did preserve some streets. However it's not an acceptable process for
39 Montgomery County and we understand that.

40
41 Councilmember Berliner,
42 Thank you for that, understanding that and implementing a new system, so, thank you.

43
44 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Council Vice-President Andrews.

2
3 Councilmember Andrews,
4 Thank you. Yes, micropave got a macro of complaints.

5
6 Councilmember Floreen,
7 That's good.

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 I think you could patent that.

11
12 Councilmember Andrews,
13 Yeah. But I do want to say that my office has a lot of dealings with your Department on
14 constituent issues regarding repaving, and resurfacing, and tree trimming, and I want to
15 say how responsive the Department is and particularly how responsive my office has
16 found Keith Compton to be in working on these issues. So thank you for your attention
17 to this.

18
19 Council President Knapp,
20 Councilmember Leventhal.

21
22 Councilmember Leventhal,
23 Yeah. Following along on Mr. Berliner's point, and I know all of us have been in touch
24 with the same gentleman, but the question that his constituents and our constituents in
25 Rollingwood is asking is what is now the schedule for going back over those areas that
26 were micropaved? So, you may not have an answer for that now and there may not
27 actually be an answer, but if it's 45 years, or whatever it is, at some point you could get
28 back to us on that, because in my, and I know I'm not the only one who's had multiple
29 rounds of correspondence with this gentleman. The last round was I explained the good
30 news that the Committee had agreed and that the Department had agreed and that we
31 were moving ahead with hot mix asphalt and that was not satisfactory because he
32 wants to know when we're going back over the micropave that was already put down.

33
34 Art Holmes,
35 I think that we answered just that question for Mr. Berlin.

36
37 Councilmember Leventhal,
38 I'm sure you did. Maybe I could get a copy of that.

39
40 Art Holmes,
41 It's a significant amount when you start to go back.

42
43 Councilmember Leventhal,
44 Some years.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Art Holmes,
3 And then when you look at then the roads that are still in need of something being done.

4
5 Councilmember Leventhal,
6 Right. But perhaps could you share that response with me as well.

7
8 Art Holmes,
9 We can get that for you.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 Okay.

13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 Okay?

16
17 Council President Knapp,
18 Drive on so to speak.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 Street tree preservation, a key issue for many communities in terms of tree
22 maintenance, pruning, and the like. You have the list on page 13 of those communities
23 where the work has been done or planning to be completed in this year as arranged
24 throughout the County and then for further years. We have recommended to raise the
25 level of the program a bit to 2 million annually in fiscal years '11, '12, and 3 million in
26 fiscal years '13 and '14. A huge community issue. More often heard after a hurricane or
27 something of that nature. But one that we've been working on the past few years. Next
28 is mass transit. There are a variety of initiatives here. There are a certain number of
29 transit centers underway, where there is one modest timing change with respect to the
30 Silver Spring Transit Center. Otherwise things are moving ahead. There is some
31 increase in costs for the Montgomery Mall Transit Center that is undergoing review and
32 construction, it's been delayed a bit and of course, there have been community issues
33 over there. But it's in the budget and the Committee supports that. Likewise, in the, the
34 White Oak Transit Center, some of you will recall that's designed to serve in part the
35 FDA expansion as well. Of course some details. Ride on fleet expansion. We have been
36 talking a lot about that previously. Glenn has backed off from his recommendation with
37 respect to the capital budget for ride on fleet expansion because of the cost issue. But
38 that doesn't mean the issue goes away. We'll be looking at it in.

39
40 Glenn Orlin,
41 I guess procedurally Ms. Floreen, right now the Committee recommendation is to do this
42 but the Committee hasn't, I mean, I'm making a recommendation to the Committee
43 essentially to take this up. But the committee itself has not voted on this.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,
2 Well, I don't know where Mr. Leventhal is on this. We had recommended it because you
3 told us we could afford. If we can't afford it we'll have to come back to it.
4

5 Councilmember Leventhal,
6 I'm sorry, come back? Where?
7

8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 This is the ride on fleet expansion.
10

11 Glenn Orlin,
12 This is the ride on fleet expansion project. This is the subject of addendum two where,
13 remember I had said we thought we had \$40 million more in the transportation impact
14 tax revenues that had not been programmed by the Executive that the Council could
15 look to add. But in talking with OMB and Finance the last few days recognize it's really
16 only, as described in addendum two, there's only 22 and a half that can be spent. So
17 one of the ways of essentially closing, bringing the Committee's recommendation close
18 to about the same place in terms of the additional bond funding that will be added is to
19 strip out this recommendation from the project.
20

21 Art Holmes,
22 But remember as --, you've got the facilities, you're going to need to have the vehicles.
23

24 Councilmember Floreen,
25 My personal view is, this is the only Committee, because we have Glenn, where we
26 worry about all the details of the CIP.
27

28 Glenn Orlin,
29 Well.
30

31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 Which is a good thing.
33

34 Glenn Orlin,
35 It's \$14 million.
36

37 Councilmember Floreen,
38 Well, it's plenty of money and the question is at what point we address it. We can
39 address it in the next CIP in two years.
40

41 Glenn Orlin,
42 Yeah.
43

44 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 Or in the course of the operating budget, so, whether it's here or not will continue to be
2 a priority.

3
4 Councilmember Leventhal,
5 I don't feel, unlike some of the things we talked about.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,
8 Yeah.

9
10 Councilmember Leventhal,
11 In libraries, I don't feel strongly that having a PDF that isn't funded.

12
13 Councilmember Floreen,
14 Doesn't make a difference.

15
16 Councilmember Leventhal,
17 On this, for several years, we're not, it's not that important whether or not we have the
18 PDF if we're not doing.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 Right.

22
23 Councilmember Leventhal,
24 It in the next two years anyway.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,
27 Right. Right. I would agree. So, I think the Committee recommendation is with Glenn,
28 hold off this one and we'll come back to it. Mr. Berliner, do you want to comment on
29 that?

30
31 Councilmember Berliner,
32 Yes. I'd like a little more conversation [INAUDIBLE] with the depot that we actually have
33 the additional capacity the depot gives us, that we actually have the buses
34 [INAUDIBLE].

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 I mean, if folks want to leave it in, it can always be subject to the reconciliation effort that
38 inevitably occurs at the closing days of the budget. You know, if you want to leave it in,
39 it's.

40
41 Councilmember Berliner,
42 I'd prefer to leave it in.

43
44 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 Okay. Let's leave it in and Mr. Orlin will make it work.

2
3 Councilmember Elrich,
4 We're going to make it work.

5
6 Glenn Orlin,
7 Cha ching.

8
9 Councilmember Floreen,
10 Moving on, we've got the Bethesda Metro Station South Entrance. This was not
11 recommended by the County Executive. This is really the passion of Mr. Leventhal in
12 particular. The Committee agreed that in our previous, last time we looked at the CIP,
13 we identified a contribution from our state participation project money to, a 5 million
14 contribution I believe to look at the design of this effort. This will be critical to the
15 success of the Purple Line but even without the Purple Line, it will provide an access
16 point, southern access point to the Bethesda Metro Station that has always been
17 anticipated and in fact the building that this will be associated with was designed with
18 the expectation that at some point within someone's lifetime this would actually occur so
19 what this does is it funds, it puts \$55 million into the CIP. We're talking construction
20 dollars in fiscal years '12 through '14. This will accommodate, there is a design that we
21 saw in the T&E Committee meeting that will have platforms that will connect to the
22 southern end and provide another station, basically a full access point to the Bethesda
23 Metro Station. It will also provide an access point for the Purple Line terminus at that
24 location. It is on Elm Street, just to the west, I guess, of the theaters there. This effort, of
25 course, is not without its complexity. It will require the closing of Elm Street to make this
26 happen and we were reminded in Committee that the challenge of that initiative is that
27 Woodmont Avenue, there's a lot of construction happening in southern Bethesda and
28 part of that is the Lot 31 Project which is the parking lot across from the Barnes and
29 Noble down there where the County is a participant with the private sector. That whole
30 project will require Woodmont Avenue to be closed and consequently, community
31 members will need a way to access that area and we cannot permit Elm Street to be
32 closed until that issue is, that effort is concluded, so that affects the timing initiative here
33 so that's the recommendation on Bethesda Metro.

34
35 Council President Knapp,
36 Councilmember Elrich.

37
38 Councilmember Elrich,
39 I have a couple questions about this. Source of funds would be?

40
41 Glenn Orlin,
42 GO Bonds.

43
44 Councilmember Elrich,



March 11, 2008

1 I was afraid you were going to say that.

2
3 Councilmember Floreen,

4 Let me just say there is an expectation that we will work out an agreement with the state
5 as to how this would be considered with respect to the Purple Line.

6
7 Councilmember Elrich,
8 Right.

9
10 Councilmember Floreen,

11 There are a few details, T's to be cross and I's to be dotted as to exactly how that would
12 be worded.

13
14 Councilmember Elrich,
15 Yeah.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,

18 So that the County's contribution to this would be recognized in the appropriate fashion.

19
20 Councilmember Elrich,

21 I think it's critical that it be recognized but I also think that, I don't want to start
22 construction on this until we know that the Purple Line is going to be built because while
23 there's merit in the south, in an entrance there, there's not \$60 million merit to an
24 entrance without a Purple Line and for \$60 million we could do a heck of a lot of other
25 transportation projects in the County that are sorely lacking. So, while I have no problem
26 with doing this, as long as there's a guarantee that there's no expenditure on
27 construction until the state is clear that they are actually going to do the Purple Line and
28 that it's going to go through that station and there's a need for this entrance. Because I
29 think it would be a mistake to build it otherwise.

30
31 Glenn Orlin,

32 There's no appropriation for construction in this budget and there would not be one in
33 FY10 either, I think, or '11 I think, it's FY12 would be.

34
35 Councilmember Elrich,
36 So it's the last three.

37
38 Glenn Orlin,

39 Fiscal year '12 would be the first year there'd be a construction appropriation so, you
40 know, by then, then maybe we'll do it.

41
42 Councilmember Elrich,
43 We'll know.



March 11, 2008

1 Edgar Gonzalez,

2 And there is a position that is consist with the Executive's position on it. When he saw
3 that he was going to be funded beyond the first two years, he said well, we'll have
4 another round, so he was also okay with the idea.

5
6 Councilmember Elrich,
7 Okay.

8
9 Council President Knapp,
10 Councilmember Berliner.

11
12 Councilmember Berliner,
13 I had similar reservations to Councilmember Elrich with respect to this. I am a supporter
14 of the Inner Purple Line and I believe we need to do a lot of things to make it happen
15 but I wasn't comfortable in tying \$60 million up in our CIP with respect to this until one
16 had a signal that the feds were going to step up and do their share. I had explored with
17 staff and with Councilmember Leventhal the possibility of having a contingent clause in
18 here contingent upon the federal government. That was problematic insofar as part of
19 our desire with respect to moving forward would be that this not be included in the cost
20 benefit analysis that the feds do with respect to this project, if they perceive that this is
21 the County taking this on, that it would reduce that much money from the project's
22 analysis to determine whether rider ship, et cetera, is appropriate. I understand all that
23 and I further understand from staff that there is no appropriation, that we've pushed this
24 off '12 so that the fundamental reality is that we will in fact be in a position to say no,
25 we're not going to spend these dollars if in fact this project does not materialize in the
26 timeframe contemplated here. That's my understanding, is that correct?

27
28 Glenn Orlin,
29 That's correct. What you're essentially doing is you're creating fiscal space to be able to
30 do this in fiscal years '12, '13, and '14.

31
32 Councilmember Berliner,
33 Right.

34
35 Glenn Orlin,
36 But again, the appropriation, the authority to spend the money to pay WMATA or MTA
37 to build it is not in this budget.

38
39 Councilmember Berliner,
40 And you had previously indicated that you felt that the biggest constraint we were facing
41 in our CIP process is '10, '11, and '12.

42
43 Glenn Orlin,
44 Right.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Berliner,

So to the extent to which we have problems in '12, I hope you will report that back to us so we can make value judgments with respect to the dollars that are in here for '12 versus other projects.

Glenn Orlin,
Right.

Councilmember Berliner,
Thank you.

Council President Knapp,
Councilmember Leventhal.

Councilmember Leventhal,
Well, I think my colleagues' questions are excellent and I just wanted to remind my colleagues that the addition by the T&E Committee of this PDF does not increase the cost of the CIP because we paid for it and as Glenn describes on pages 34 through 36 of the packet, we already had sent to us by the County Executive in the CIP, a very large item for state transportation participation of which only a very small amount, I think the total PDF in the state transportation participation, is that PDF here? I think it was about 160 million.

Councilmember Floreen,
Get to it in a few minutes.

Councilmember Leventhal,
Or so of which only 40 to 45 million had already been spoken for through memoranda of understanding.

Glenn Orlin,
Circle 101.

Councilmember Leventhal,
Circle 101, okay.

Glenn Orlin,
Is the current project and what the Committee's recommending now.

Councilmember Leventhal,
Circle 101, the County Executive sent to us a PDF with a total of just under 165 million of which memoranda of understanding have only, are only in place now, am I right, looking in the packet here for 40 to 45 million of that, so to program another 55 million of



March 11, 2008

1 that for the Bethesda South Entrance which is consistent with the purposes of this PDF,
2 we are working with the state on a project that relieves congestion. It's consistent with
3 the purpose that the County Executive sent this over. We just directed that this amount
4 be spent for the Bethesda South Metro Entrance. So including this in our CIP does not
5 add anything to the CIP that the County Executive sent over. It's paid for.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,

8 And basically overall, the memo, Glenn's memo on page two at the bottom does show
9 the source of funding expenditure changes within the CIP, I said at the beginning, we
10 really have not added a tremendous amount to the overall challenge of this CIP on the
11 scale of things and we have included, you know, the dollars in terms of the projects that
12 we're proceeding on.

13
14 Council President Knapp,
15 Councilmember.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 So, it's all timing.

19
20 Council President Knapp,
21 Councilmember Berliner.

22
23 Councilmember Berliner,
24 Dr. Orlin was gracious enough to remind me that he and I had had another conversation
25 with respect to this project as it relates to the fact that as it's stated on page 17 that we
26 do have, and as I believe the Chair of the Committee observed, we do have the
27 prospect of Woodmont Avenue being closed as a function of the Lot 31 and Glenn and I
28 had talked about the possibility of adding language to the PDF that would make it clear
29 that certainly the Council's intention is not to have a situation in which we have both Elm
30 Street and Woodmont Street closed simultaneously. That that would be a nightmare.

31
32 Councilmember Leventhal,
33 I agree with that.

34
35 Councilmember Berliner,
36 And so if we could have that added to that PDF.

37
38 Glenn Orlin,
39 Right.

40
41 Councilmember Berliner,
42 I would be grateful.

43
44 Councilmember Leventhal,



March 11, 2008

1 I agree with that.. Mr. President? I do, I have no objection to that, to Mr. Berliner's point
2 on that, but I do want to point out that when we talk about, does the Bethesda South
3 Entrance have value independent of the Purple Line and then we think about the Lot 31
4 Project coming online, the Woodmont East Project coming online, the existing
5 businesses in Bethesda row, all of which are located right there, the letter that we got
6 from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce just yesterday, there is great
7 value to this Metro entrance. I firmly believe that the Purple Line will be built, however,
8 independent of the Purple Line, the businesses and residents and shops and the new
9 projects that we are all aware of, including Lot 31 that are going to happen there are
10 going to get substantial benefit from this Bethesda South Metro Entrance. So when we
11 talk about Lot 31 it just underscores that point.

12
13 Councilmember Floreen,
14 Alright. Continuing. Pedestrian and bike way projects. There are a collection of consent
15 projects that T&E Committee agreed with how it's being funded or scheduled by the
16 County Executive. These include the Greentree Road sidewalk, MacArthur Boulevard
17 improvements, Matthew Henson Trail, Shady Grove Access bike path, Silver Spring
18 Green Trail, might note that's associated with Wayne Avenue in Silver Spring, and the
19 US 29 sidewalks. We did adjust the Shady Grove Access bike path PDF some
20 additional language. There were some.

21
22 Council President Knapp,
23 I had a question on.

24
25 Councilmember Floreen,
26 On that?

27
28 Council President Knapp,
29 On the bike projects. The region actually has, through the transportation.

30
31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 We have a bike way program we're going to get to in a second too.

33
34 Council President Knapp,
35 Okay. Well, I just wanted, if it's for both, I'm just curious as how in the region's bike
36 master plan or bike plan that is presented each year as a part of the TIP, how that, do
37 these projects fit anything that we have submitted there for the region's transportation?

38
39 Edgar Gonzalez,
40 Yeah, we always update our TIP on the basis of what is in the capital program, every
41 time. Dave Morris does that for us.

42
43 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 The bike master plan that's for the region, these projects are projects that were funded
2 in the, or at least identified in the TIP for the region?

3
4 Edgar Gonzalez,
5 They should be.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Okay.

9
10 Edgar Gonzalez,
11 They should be.

12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 I just, I wanted.

15
16 Edgar Gonzalez,
17 Yes we.

18
19 Council President Knapp,
20 All I've seen it is presented down there so I just was curious as to how it dovetailed.

21
22 Art Holmes,
23 They're supposed to do that.

24
25 Edgar Gonzalez,
26 Yeah.

27
28 Council President Knapp,
29 Okay.

30
31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 Okay. There were questions about the Executive's pedestrian safety initiative in
33 Committee, we understand that there will be some additional approaches to that in the,
34 the forthcoming operating budget. But there is money within the budget for the annual
35 sidewalk program and we'll talk about some of the details there. Some money is
36 proposed for high incidents area treatment and there are a variety of programs
37 underway that are funded in this budget but not as much as was previously announced
38 but we'll see what we hear on Monday. There are some ADA compliance initiatives that,
39 oh, I'm sorry. You had a question on that?

40
41 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
42 Yeah, I actually do. I very much appreciate the initiative and I think we all understand
43 the significance of putting something like this in place. The one question I have relates
44 to the Brack relocation and I would note that in the environmental impact statement that



March 11, 2008

1 we have on that, there's an indication that there are significant safety and access issues
2 right around Bethesda Naval Hospital area and is that part of the pedestrian safety
3 initiative?

4
5 Art Holmes,

6 No, it isn't. We're working with the state, and you may remember that the state has put
7 some monies in the long range plan, some \$45 million for that. It's certainly not enough
8 and we talked just last week with the admiral who commands Bethesda and talking to
9 go him about the ones that we think should be done right away and that is a widening of
10 355 and I believe there are four or five intersections that need to be improved. We have
11 identified those to him and made some suggestions to him as to how the Navy can help
12 and also to help us get additional federal funds.

13
14 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
15 Right.

16
17 Art Holmes,
18 One of the, go ahead.

19
20 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
21 Uh-huh. Well, what I would ask is that that area be included in the safety initiative. I
22 think that would be a reasonable request. It sounds like, it sound like some
23 conversations are occurring but I just want to make sure that it's a priority so that's really
24 the basis.

25
26 Art Holmes,
27 I'll take that back.

28
29 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
30 Right.

31
32 Art Holmes,
33 The safety initiative is a program that the Executive has structured. We also have a
34 particular program that we're working with with BRAC, with the state, so, I certainly will
35 take it back.

36
37 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
38 I think the overlap would be useful. I think it would be constructive.

39
40 Councilmember Floreen,
41 Marc.

42
43 Councilmember Elrich,



March 11, 2008

1 Do we have any sense of, regarding BRAC what we may need to do that the state's not
2 going to do in terms of magnitude of expenditure? One of my concerns is that when
3 we're all done with this, they seem to be going forward with it at a merry clip.

4
5 Art Holmes,

6 I think our estimates were around \$70 million, am I right? I believe our estimates were
7 around \$70 million. We've asked the congressional delegation to provide us money.
8 This may be out of, out of bounds but if we have to, these are all state roads. These are
9 all state. And so we're working with the state to try to get them to do something. We
10 may have to come back to you and ask for some forward funding for these particular
11 improvements and I think that that's, would be good use of some of the funds we're
12 talking about.

13
14 Councilmember Elrich,

15 But of course forward funding, I mean, giving to the state is not a.

16
17 Art Holmes,

18 I'm not saying give it to them. I would want to go into some kind of MOU with them that
19 would say we would do this for them to accelerate, rather than giving them.

20
21 Councilmember Elrich,

22 My concern is, I mean, if you, the more stuff we forward fund, the more that competes
23 with other things we want anyway.

24
25 Art Holmes,

26 I understand.

27
28 Councilmember Elrich,

29 And the state is not, near as I can tell, an open spigot for money for this County. So it's
30 not as simple as simply saying well, we're going to forward fund it and we're going to get
31 it back. We may forward fund it, we may get it back but then something else that we
32 want money for may not ever happen.

33
34 Art Holmes,

35 Sir, I couldn't agree with you more but if we want to do things, there are resources that
36 have to be coming forward and I'm wondering where are we going to get them if we
37 don't get them from the state. And as I indicated, \$45 million over the six-year period is
38 not enough.

39
40 Councilmember Elrich,

41 I agree with you completely we need to think of where it's going to come from.

42
43 Art Holmes,

44 And we're working with the Navy and with the Congress trying to get additional funds.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Councilmember Elrich,
3 I'm not blaming, this is not anybody's fault here. It's just a.
4
5 Art Holmes,
6 Oh, no, I understand.
7
8 Councilmember Elrich,
9 It's just a reality of like how do you balance competing things.
10
11 Art Holmes,
12 No. I agree with you.
13
14 Councilmember Floreen,
15 And we agree and we have, well, we'll get to in a bit, there are some resources that we
16 do have available for negotiating with the state, but basically this is primarily a federal
17 issue and I think we want.
18
19 Art Holmes,
20 The feds will say that they.
21
22 Councilmember Floreen,
23 I think we're not going to anticipate their denials until they.
24
25 Art Holmes,
26 Right.
27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 Denials of responsibility until the ink is dry.
30
31 Art Holmes,
32 I agree with you and I think we can stay on the Department of Defense and the
33 Department of Navy until they do something.
34
35 Councilmember Floreen,
36 Exactly. They're here for us.
37
38 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
39 But let's be proactive.
40
41 Councilmember Floreen,
42 So anyways, I was getting to the annual bike way program. We've, the Committee
43 recommends that we increase that by 255, not much, thousand annually so that, and
44 that will allow us to construct the needed bike path along Needwood Road to connect



March 11, 2008

1 some dots between the ICC bike trail and Beech Drive in Derwood. Then we have the
2 annual sidewalk program where the Committee also agrees to, that we should be
3 adding a million dollars annually starting in fiscal '11. This is a huge issue in terms of
4 pedestrian accessibility throughout the County and we know for a fact this is not
5 enough, but at least it gets us going. The reason it's not enough as you can see from
6 the next item is Dale Drive sidewalk. It is an unbelievably expensive project but a
7 critically important one we think for the Down County in this particular neck of the woods
8 between Coleville Road and Piney Branch. Basically, it has a very high price, \$6 million
9 for less than half a mile length of sidewalk. We said you've got, there must be a better
10 way so we're asking them to come up with a better way to do this design and we
11 thought we would get better information from the Department within the next couple
12 months before the budget is sealed. We think there's some better ways to do this. This
13 is the challenge with adding pedestrian accessibility in infill neighborhoods, particularly
14 where you've got some challenging slopes. The next one, Falls Road eastside hiker
15 biker trail, we support this project.

16
17 Councilmember Berliner,
18 And we thank you.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 You're welcome. We're all about hikers and bikers. Luckily though, we're not wearing
22 our spandex today. Metropolitan Branch Trail, we'd like to include this in the CIP. We're
23 not recommending that it be included right now because we've looked at this in
24 Committee over the years and it appears that the more we look at it, the more
25 complicated it gets in between, as between the issues of CSX, the redevelopment
26 issues in south Silver Spring, the transit center, you name it, there's a problem wherever
27 you turn. This is a true alphabet soup of arguing departments so it's not ready for prime
28 time but it should be. Another one, well, something we're not doing is Redland Road
29 sidewalk, we're deferring to Mr. Andrews on this issue.

30
31 Council President Knapp,
32 Hold on. Hold on. Council Vice-President Andrews has some comments on Redland
33 Road.

34
35 Councilmember Andrews,
36 Well, actually, I think this was not recommended by the County Executive and I think
37 there's a good reason why it isn't. First of all, money is tight and pedestrian usage of this
38 part of Redland Road, not other parts, but this part is light and would likely remain so
39 given the distance that you have between that part of Redland Road and many other
40 destinations such as the Metro. It's a long way. I know this road very well and there are
41 sidewalks that I've been working for that are very nearby which need to be completed,
42 such as the connection on Needwood Road between Redland and Deer Lake which
43 needs to be constructed so there's a continuous sidewalk there where people do walk to
44 the Metro regularly at some risk to themselves. And another example of a sidewalk that



March 11, 2008

1 should be a very high priority is the sidewalk that needs to be put on Central Avenue
2 which is a residential street and which is near Washington Grove Elementary School
3 which is a very dangerous street to walk along. I don't think you're going to see, even if
4 the sidewalk were built, a lot of usage of it and I think that, I agree with the County
5 Executive's determination that it doesn't, doesn't get on the priority list, especially given
6 how many other sidewalks that are waiting to be built.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 We, oh, I'm sorry. More? Go ahead George.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 That's alright. Mr. Councilmember Leventhal.

13
14 Councilmember Leventhal,
15 Just wanted to point out to the Council Vice-President on page 22, Glenn correctly
16 notes but I just wanted to make sure you noticed that the Committee gave great
17 deference to the Council Vice-President views on this matter.

18
19 Councilmember Andrews,
20 I did notice that. Thank you.

21
22 Councilmember Floreen,
23 We did.

24
25 Councilmember Andrews,
26 Don't stop there.

27
28 Councilmember Floreen,
29 Okay. Even though there were two at large people who would have a point of view but
30 we're deferring to you on this.

31
32 Glenn Orlin,
33 Even though – favorably until they heard that information.

34
35 Councilmember Floreen,
36 And we are saving even more money on the next item. US 29 sidewalks, the west side.
37 We balked at the price period. It was missing links of sidewalk along the west side of
38 Coleville Road from Southwood Avenue near Four Corners up to Burnt Mills. This is a
39 \$5 million project initially and now it's up to just about \$10 million. And seeing as we are
40 in the process of constructing the eastside sidewalks we just couldn't justify this
41 particular expenditure so we propose to delete the balance of this project. Not that it
42 isn't a nice thing to do but the dollars were just, it was \$2,600 a foot or 27 depending
43 upon how you include it so we just said nice but no cigar.



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,
2 Okay.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Moving on to the always easy road section of the CIP. There are a couple of consent
6 projects, such as they are, that the T&E Committee recommends. And there is a certain
7 amount of language associated with how transportation impact tax revenues should be
8 associated with some of these initiatives that we show on a recommended PDF. The
9 next one is really just a bit of housekeeping on the Bethesda CBD streetscape initiative.
10 It's, it appears to be moving along but there is, we don't need quite as much money as
11 had been programmed so we're recommending removing a, reducing the cost by about
12 \$300,000. The next one is the Burtonsville Access Road. We can have some talk about
13 this if people would like, but the fact of the matter is that the experts tell us that the
14 urgency for this initiative is not as strong as it was when it was first proposed, and given
15 the other work that's going on in this area, we propose that we retain the project but
16 delay its construction until later. Facility planning for transportation, we are going with
17 the County Executive to continue to do planning and design even if we don't know
18 exactly when we're going to be able to program these initiatives for construction. It's a
19 balancing act but I do think, and I think the Committee does believe it is incumbent upon
20 us to move forward as aggressively as we can with important ideas and when it comes
21 to adding new projects to the CIP, we're going to have to make some hard decisions
22 with respect to financing. As I said at the beginning though, transportation funding is not
23 what it should be, it has gone down over time and it is embracing a increasingly smaller
24 portion of our capital budget, but we think we need to persevere nonetheless. Father
25 Hurley Boulevard, this is building four-lane extension of the Father Hurley from Wisteria
26 Drive to Maryland 118 with a hiker biker trail and a sidewalk. There's a cost increase
27 and completion schedule has been delayed a bit and we concur with the County
28 Executive on that. That's, you know, just the way it is.

29
30 Council President Knapp,
31 Just a quick question on that one.

32
33 Councilmember Floreen,
34 Sure.

35
36 Council President Knapp,
37 Have we gotten any feedback from CSX as it relates to this notion of constructing a third
38 track or is this just someday maybe in the future if everything goes the right way?

39
40 Edgar Gonzalez,
41 Boy, this is the ongoing issue with CSX, every time we have a project they bring this up.
42 In some cases they force us, especially in a case where we have a new bridge, they
43 force us to create the, expand the third rail and that's what happened here. Some cases
44 when we are expanding or we're replacing an existing bridge that in some cases is



March 11, 2008

1 theirs, they are a little more flexible and they allow us to move forward but they are
2 worse than the federal government, it's impossible to deal with these people.

3
4 Council President Knapp,
5 So, but in order for us to move ahead we've got to have their approval.

6
7 Edgar Gonzalez,
8 Absolutely.

9
10 Council President Knapp,
11 So they hold that over us until we.

12
13 Edgar Gonzalez,
14 Absolutely.

15
16 Council President Knapp,
17 How many other bridge spans up and down CSX tracks in Montgomery County.

18
19 Edgar Gonzalez,
20 Oh my goodness, we have at least 20.

21
22 Council President Knapp,
23 But how many are actually at the level that they'd want this one to be, at the right width?
24 Any?

25
26 Edgar Gonzalez,
27 Yeah, there are a couple that they have forced us to do, maybe two or three but the
28 majority are just two tracks. They are all bridges. I mean we had that fight with them.
29 You talk and you talk and they send attorneys and they send letters and it takes four
30 months for them to reply. You get to the point that you have to give up.

31
32 Council President Knapp,
33 It's easier just to spend the \$5 million.

34
35 Edgar Gonzalez,
36 You just give up.

37
38 Art Holmes,
39 Very difficult.

40
41 Council President Knapp,
42 Great. That's helpful. Okay. Thanks.

43
44 Edgar Gonzalez,



March 11, 2008

1 You understand what we're going through on the Metropolitan Trail.

2
3 Councilmember Floreen,

4 So there's always something. Next Goshen Road south, the Committee concurs with
5 the County Executive that we should program design for this initiative. We do not have
6 the money in though for construction. There is an estimate that it would, it's big dollars
7 that we're looking at here, 95 to \$125 million would ultimately widen Goshen Road from
8 Gerard Street to north of Warfield to make it into four lanes with a median, a sidewalk,
9 and a hiker biker trail. In other words, a functional road as opposed to the lovely quiet
10 country road overwhelmed by traffic we currently have. But nonetheless, we are not
11 proposing that it be fully funded at this point. There are surely going, are issues
12 associated with that.

13
14 Council President Knapp,

15 Just a quick question. I appreciate your paragraphing here, Glenn. Of the projects we've
16 got through so far as it relates to when a project goes to construction, as you say here
17 phase two facility planning, once that's complete is when things typically go, of the
18 projects we've talked about today, how many of them have actually made it that far in
19 the process?

20
21 Glenn Orlin,

22 I think all of them but this.

23
24 Council President Knapp,

25 Okay. So everything is through phase two.

26
27 Glenn Orlin,

28 Well, no, I take that, Bethesda Southern Entrance really has not been.

29
30 Council President Knapp,

31 Okay. So we're actually still fairly consistent?

32
33 Glenn Orlin,

34 Fairly.

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,

37 Sort of.

38
39 Council President Knapp,

40 Just trying to get a sense. Okay.

41
42 Councilmember Floreen,

43 Highway noise abatement, this, there is a lot of history here for folks who haven't been
44 part of that experience in the past. And basically it shows that work is underway. There



March 11, 2008

1 are policy issues to be resolved that haven't been resolved yet. When do we expect that
2 to be nailed down? The Committee, this is a question of individual homeowner
3 contribution to noise abatement walls under, and under which and what circumstances?
4

5 Edgar Gonzalez,

6 We started the project already. Glenn participates in the process. We are anticipating
7 six to eight meetings every other week so I would say three to four months we'll be
8 finished. Hopefully less than that.
9

10 Glenn Orlin,

11 Hopefully.
12

13 Edgar Gonzalez,

14 Hopefully less than that.
15

16 Councilmember Floreen,

17 Okay. It's been going on for awhile. Phil, did you want to come in on this?
18

19 Councilmember Andrews,

20 Just very quickly. I just want to let people know that we actually are scheduled to see
21 the first noise walls go up under this policy.
22

23 Councilmember Floreen,

24 Really.
25

26 Councilmember Andrews,

27 Later this spring. They're being manufactured now I'm told, and so those residents in
28 Derwood along Shady Grove Road who will benefit from those noise walls I'm sure will
29 be very happy, they've waited a long time and the residents at Derwood particularly Bill,
30 Pat Levouda, Bill Levouda, especially, who served and continues to work on this issue
31 helped get this program going. It's an important one because part of the impact of
32 building roads is dealing with the noise that results from it and the County is now trying
33 to adjust to that with some of the roads that have been built where you have high
34 decibel levels and Shady Grove Road is one of those. So, it's good to see that we
35 actually will see the first noise walls put up under this policy sometime this year. Looking
36 forward to that. Thank you.
37

38 Councilmember Floreen,

39 Okay. We're going to skip ahead and then come back to Montrose Parkway East so,
40 first of all, we're going to talk about, let's see here.
41

42 Glenn Orlin,

43 Page 32 is the next project.
44



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,
2 Nebel Street on page 32 and try and accelerate through the rest of those on the roads
3 piece and then come back to that.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,
6 Yeah, Nebel Street Extended, basically, this is a project that's been on the books for
7 awhile, our effort to create some ability to move around in north Bethesda. It extends
8 Nebel Street north from Randolph over to, through or through I guess, Sticks and Stuff
9 and next to Target up to Brewer Avenue so that's been a project, obviously a complex,
10 but underway and of course there is an increase in cost to acknowledge construction
11 cost inflation. There's a project associated with reimbursement of developers for street
12 construction abutting County facilities and that's what it is there. Number ten, the
13 number's gone down a little bit. That's our obligation.

14
15 Council President Knapp,
16 Councilmember Elrich.

17
18 Councilmember Elrich,
19 I'm not quite sure where this discussion would fit but it has to do with the actual
20 interchange of Montrose at 355. I raise it here because I know there is discussion about
21 an alternate intersection which I thought had some merit particularly in terms of
22 connectivity.

23
24 Councilmember Floreen,
25 Let's talk about this.

26
27 Councilmember Elrich,
28 I just wondering whether these streets here related to that because.

29
30 Councilmember Floreen,
31 No.

32
33 Councilmember Elrich,
34 So they have no bearing on.

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 None.

38
39 Councilmember Elrich,
40 On getting over there. Okay.

41
42 Councilmember Floreen,
43 Nebel is assumed in that.



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,
2 Okay.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Yeah. But it's a conversation we had. Randolph Road from Rock Creek to Charles
6 Road, this is a little segment of Randolph that's a mess and they're trying to address
7 some safety issues there. We recommend that it go forward as planned. Park and
8 Planning had some issues about redesign to include a bike way, the majority of the
9 Committee didn't think that the project should be redesigned by adding that element.

10
11 Councilmember Ervin,
12 Even though.

13
14 Council President Knapp,
15 Councilmember Ervin.

16
17 Councilmember Ervin,
18 It was recommended in the master plan.

19
20 Councilmember Floreen,
21 Yeah.

22
23 Councilmember Ervin,
24 I'll just kind of reiterate that. I think that we're making a mistake on that. We'll come back
25 at some point and say we should have done it.

26
27 Councilmember Floreen,
28 Well, I don't know. I'm going to ride that road with you in our bike shorts and see what
29 you think.

30
31 Council President Knapp,
32 Okay.

33
34 Councilmember Floreen,
35 The Snouffer School Road improvements, we're not going to do them. But Glenn, there
36 are issues associated with that and I guess this is just a heads up, this is an issue
37 coming down the road as it were, but not now.

38
39 Glenn Orlin,
40 The only reason why it's in there is because in projects that have finished facility
41 planning we routinely show the Council and this is one where everybody agreed not to
42 go forward with it.

43
44 Councilmember Floreen,



March 11, 2008

1 Yeah. State transportation participation, and I alluded to this previously, this is a
2 program that we put together several years ago that's designed to advance projects that
3 are on state roads basically. Historically there had, years ago Montgomery County had
4 been more willing to step to the table and negotiate.

5
6 Councilmember Leventhal,
7 Roads and transit, Madam Chair?

8
9 Councilmember Floreen,
10 Yeah, yeah.

11
12 Councilmember Leventhal,
13 Roads and transit.

14
15 Councilmember Floreen,
16 Yeah, I'm sorry, roads and, yeah, years ago the County had been willing to sit at the
17 table with the state and negotiate a County contribution to move state projects forward.
18 That was less evident during the late, I don't know when that started, mid '90's.

19
20 Edgar Gonzalez,
21 1990.

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 During the '90's and until relatively recently the County decided not to do that. We
25 reinvigorated that approach several years ago, and as you will see, under this approach
26 we have identified both GO bonds and revenue bonds associated with the County liquor
27 fund to pay for key transportation improvements. Some of that money has been
28 allocated to the Glenmont Metro Garage, some to the Bethesda Metro Southern
29 Entrance, some to the Georgia Avenue Randolph Road Interchange, and some for the
30 Watkins Mill Road Interchange, as well as last summer we allocated dollars to
31 accelerate the construction of the Maryland 355 Montrose Road Interchange because of
32 its importance to the Montrose Parkway initiative. I will say these are projects that are
33 within the County budget, the few projects that actually add significant transportation
34 capacity, both on roadways and in transit. And that's why we have singled this out as a
35 key initiative. You will note that on page 35 the two elements that we think are key here
36 and for us to focus on really later on this year when we're going to revisit the County's
37 transportation priority list when we get more information from Park and Planning and
38 once we're done with the budget, but those two initiatives where we believe we have
39 some significant ability to negotiate with the state to get some real meaningful projects
40 in the ground that will help our residents, will be with respect to constructing the Watkins
41 Mill Road Extended bridge over I-270 and also accelerating the design and construction
42 of a portion of the Maryland 355 Montrose Road Interchange that is currently lacking.
43 That is a state project but we'd like to think that those would be doable. Those two are
44 not before us at this point but we wanted to draw your attention to this as a later



March 11, 2008

1 conversation. This is basically a pot of money that we have available to do some
2 negotiation for and as George mentioned earlier, we have drawn from this for the
3 Bethesda South Entrance so that's sort of like the Metro part, the transit initiative
4 portion.

5
6 Councilmember Leventhal,
7 And the Glenmont Garage.

8
9 Councilmember Floreen,
10 Yeah, but the new one was the Southern Entrance and these are the roadway portions
11 of that initiative, and so we believe we can deliver some good benefits for County
12 residents with these initiatives, but of course, we'll have to be working in close concert
13 with the County Executive and Mr. Holmes and Mr. Picari to make these things happen.
14 Art, did you want to say anything about what conversations have started on these?

15
16 Art Holmes,
17 Yeah. We have started the conversations with Watkins Mill and the bridge over 270 and
18 the one, the 355 Montrose Parkway Interchange, they had already gone to invitation for
19 bid and notice to proceed, I believe.

20
21 Edgar Gonzalez,
22 Yeah.

23
24 Art Holmes,
25 On that one.

26
27 Edgar Gonzalez,
28 That's under construction. They have issued notice to proceed with construction on that
29 project.

30
31 Art Holmes,
32 And that is the one that Mr. Elrich, you were talking about. We are talking to the
33 individuals who brought that forward next week, so that we will look, we are looking at
34 that.

35
36 Councilmember Elrich,
37 I'd certainly like to get some kind of.

38
39 Art Holmes,
40 Feedback.

41
42 Councilmember Elrich,
43 Feedback on it.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Floreen,
2 Yeah.

3
4 Councilmember Elrich,
5 Because it seemed to me that the merits of having that connected grade level with a
6 series of streets and it was, far outweighed putting a highway type bridge over there, or
7 a traditional interchange. I mean, it seemed there were a lot more benefits to be had.

8
9 Art Holmes,
10 Well, we're going to talk with them and we'll give you the feedback on our
11 conversations.

12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 Yeah, I'd be interested in that. I think there are a number of Councilmembers.

15
16 Councilmember Floreen,
17 Yeah. We, let me just say we appreciated those issues, a number of us have been
18 approached by folks about that issue so we inquired and I talked with Mr. Firestine just
19 the other day about where this really is in terms of contracting.

20
21 Art Holmes,
22 Yeah.

23
24 Councilmember Floreen,
25 And a process issue because they were, they are proceeding. I'm optimistic that our
26 conversations can continue but it's going to have to happen at Mr. Leggett's level.

27
28 Council President Knapp,
29 Councilmember Leventhal.

30
31 Art Holmes,
32 Next Thursday I think it is that we're talking about it.

33
34 Councilmember Leventhal,
35 I just want to underscore I think this is an extremely important initiative and I thought it
36 was a very creative thing that the last Council did, and I just want to draw attention to it
37 and emphasize it and urge our able Director to take this very seriously, this charge, and,
38 you know, when we look at our priority list, Glenn has not mentioned here all of the
39 things on our priority list but there are things that come to mind, Brookville Bypass is
40 one. He mentions Watkins Mill Exchange on I- 270. There's the Cedar Lane Intersection
41 on Wisconsin Avenue. I mean, some horrible choke points in the County that are not
42 County roads but where people are just pushing us and urging us to make progress,
43 and if my math is correct even after Bethesda South Metro Entrance, even after those
44 things for which there are memoranda of understanding we're in a position now, just



March 11, 2008

1 with this CIP to go to the state of Maryland and say we've got \$45 million, let's make a
2 deal and so I would hope that that would occur.

3
4 Art Holmes,

5 And we're in the process of doing that. We're not sitting, remember now, right now we
6 are constrained by what's in the priority letter as Ms. Floreen was saying, this may have
7 to be changed because we do have some other things we think are more advantageous
8 to us, but yes, we are talking with them and it's not a, we've done these two and we're
9 through.

10
11 Councilmember Leventhal,

12 Okay and then above and beyond that, Glenn correctly notes that we had breakfast, at
13 the top of page 35, the Council had breakfast with the Executive and we asked whether
14 the Executive was committed to this and whether he would support further issuance of
15 bonds and the Executive said he would get back to us on that and we'll just keep on
16 waiting for the Executive I guess to get back to us on that.

17
18 Art Holmes,

19 I think that meeting took place last week and.

20
21 Councilmember Leventhal,

22 We haven't heard back yet so.

23
24 Art Holmes,

25 We will make recommendations to him.

26
27 Councilmember Leventhal,

28 The matter is before the full Council today but we haven't heard back yet.

29
30 Art Holmes,

31 Right.

32
33 Councilmember Leventhal,

34 So I mean, it does expand our reach and it is I think, I think it would be very popular with
35 our constituents who also happen to be the Executive's constituents and when he holds
36 his town hall meetings and when we hold ours, it is primarily these roads and these
37 bottle necks that we hear complaints about, not, you know, with all due respect, .

38
39 Art Holmes,

40 We are sensitive to that sir.

41
42 Councilmember Leventhal,

43 You know Greenhill Road or Crabbs Branch Way or some of these others.



March 11, 2008

1 Art Holmes,
2 Okay.

3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Right. And we'll just note, because of that it's not burdening the CIP. And I think that's.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 That is good.

9
10 Councilmember Floreen,
11 Equally important.

12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 Councilmember Berliner has a question.

15
16 Councilmember Berliner,
17 I wanted to follow up on the discussion with, that Dr. Holmes who, General Holmes, I'll
18 call you lots of things.

19
20 Art Holmes,
21 Art Holmes.

22
23 Council President Knapp,
24 He's a doctor, he's a general.

25
26 Councilmember Berliner,
27 He's a doctor. We got doctors, we got generals, we got directors, we've got a lot of
28 things. Okay. As the Chair observed and as Marc observed, a number of us have had
29 presentations from those that are interested in the White Flint Sector Plan and looking
30 at a different configuration for Montrose and Wisconsin Avenue that they are looking at
31 something that would complement the new urbanism that they see emerging out of that
32 spot and they believe that an interchange of the type that we have been pursuing and
33 been pursuing for years is incompatible with this new emerging design. It had been
34 suggested to me that these people were just a little late insofar as this had gone out for
35 bid. So I am curious when you say that you will be having conversations with them with
36 respect to this and in a position to hear this, as to whether or not it is realistic to expect
37 that at this moment we could make this kind of shift because.

38
39 Art Holmes,
40 I don't know. I would, if you were asking me the probability, I would say it's very low
41 because this is something we committed to. This is something that was our first priority.
42 This is something the state has gone along with us. This is something we have provided
43 funds for. But I don't think that we should preclude looking at it and seeing what we can
44 do. But they have had a notice to proceed. So that's pretty rough.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Berliner,

And so for those of us that are not familiar with the full ramifications of a notice to proceed, is that automatic at that point or are we in a position to pause if we chose to?

Art Holmes,

It's going to, it's going to be, it's going to be a cost to you probably for nothing, for getting nothing, but I think we need to talk to them and then before we speculate as to what we.

Councilmember Berliner,

And I certainly appreciate that this is really at the last minute and that was my reaction when I heard it, I said hello, guys, I think the horse is out of the barn with respect to that.

Art Holmes,

The County Executive is very interested in us looking at it and we will do that and so, but I can't tell you any, I would say the probability of stopping it is low.

Edgar Gonzalez,

You need to remember also that this project is order of magnitude 69, \$70 million. We're accelerating 14.2, it's a state project. We don't make the final call on this.

Councilmember Berliner,

Thank you. I appreciate those clarifications.

Council President Knapp,

Councilmember Leventhal.

Councilmember Leventhal,

Yeah, I just have two more quick things I wanted to say. With respect to this initiative, state transportation participation, one of the concerns from the Executive Branch seems to be, we want to make sure we are paid back and I would just say that's not so much my concern. My concern is that we're spending transportation dollars on congestion relief and we get more congestion relief on state roads and so ultimately it would be nice to be paid back but I would not want us hesitate out of uncertainty about getting paid back because I think we'd get more bang for the buck on these projects than we do on most every other project in the CIP.

Art Holmes,

I believe that there is one already that we are not going to get paid back on. The one that we're going to get paid back is the big one there at the interchange of Montrose Parkway and 355, but I agree with you. But I agree with you. I think that's right, we can't expect at all instances to get paid back. Other jurisdictions have given money toward it.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Leventhal,
2 Other jurisdictions have done it, yes.

3
4 Art Holmes,
5 And they've gotten some things.

6
7 Councilmember Leventhal,
8 That's right.

9
10 Art Holmes,
11 And I think we have to be open as we go forward.

12
13 Councilmember Leventhal,
14 Yeah. And I just, while I have the floor, Mr. President, let me just congratulate Art and
15 Edgar and Bruce. I had occasion over the weekend to drive, I think for the first time, on
16 the new Montrose Parkway and it's swift and efficient and attractive, so it's quite a nicely
17 designed and engineered road.

18
19 Edgar Gonzalez,
20 Thank you.

21
22 Council President Knapp,
23 Councilmember Elrich.

24
25 Councilmember Elrich,
26 When you come back with numbers, I mean, if there are costs, and I think that it ought
27 to be evaluated in light of what the alternative would cost, I mean, it may be that there's
28 a penalty to us to start over but it also may be that the net cost of doing this alternative,
29 which doesn't require a bridge, is significantly less.

30
31 Art Holmes,
32 If they have decent cost figures I think we can do that but I don't know what they have
33 right now. So I would not commit myself until such time as we can talk with them and we
34 will talk with them and I think your points are very well. We've got to look at the cost in
35 comparison of the two and we will do that.

36
37 Councilmember Floreen,
38 Okay.

39
40 Council President Knapp,
41 Alright.

42
43 Councilmember Floreen,
44 And we will come back to this when we talk about Montrose Parkway as well.



March 11, 2008

1
2 Council President Knapp,
3 Okay.

4
5 Councilmember Ervin,
6 I'm sure.

7
8 Council President Knapp,
9 Subdivision roads participation.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 Subdivision roads participation, we're good with the County Executive in terms of their
13 numbers. Next issue is adding that the County Executive has proposed is to close the
14 300-foot wide gap up next to big, between Rainbow Drive and Thompson Road next to
15 Briggs Chaney Middle School and there are conditions within the master plan that this
16 project will have to meet and has met to a certain degree. So we concur with that. Next
17 issue is Woodfield Road Extended. This is up in the Route 27 area by Damascus,
18 project shockingly enough has increased in price, but that's what happens. So we
19 recommend support of that initiative.

20
21 Council President Knapp,
22 Just a quick question on that. So, the project has slipped more than two years, which
23 was already behind in the first place, so what if we, it's just a, it's the wetland, storm
24 water management, what's the biggest issue?

25
26 Bruce Johnston,
27 We have incurred a number of environmental issues including the wetlands issue,
28 which, when initially delineated and then looked at again when we started receiving
29 permits, they told us that the delineation was done wrong and so we had to re-delineate
30 it again. We encountered an historic structure, an old stone wall in this area that we had
31 to avoid and do some redesign and we've encountered a change in at least one of the
32 homes nearby the road where we're designing it, where they've added an addition to the
33 side of home, which now requires that we add an additional retaining wall in our
34 roadway. It's been a series of those kinds of issues that have caused delays in the
35 project.

36
37 Council President Knapp,
38 Alright. I actually got an e-mail yesterday from someone further down Route 124 saying
39 that there had been a lot of work that was underway that has been stopped and that the
40 road is in significant disrepair, further down 124 near where it crosses 128, so I just
41 wanted to, I don't have an answer for that yet and I got to get some more details but this
42 is the message I just got. It came in last night.

43
44 Edgar Gonzalez,



March 11, 2008

1 128?
2
3 Council President Knapp,
4 They said 124.
5
6 Edgar Gonzalez,
7 Yeah, 124.
8
9 Councilmember Floreen,
10 124 and 108.
11
12 Council President Knapp,
13 Oh, it could be, yeah, I was surprised, maybe 108. That's what they said, west of Route
14 128. Yeah, that's why.
15
16 Councilmember Floreen,
17 108.
18
19 Council President Knapp,
20 So let's go 108. But if we can check on that, if you'd get some feedback on that, I'd
21 appreciate it. Okay.
22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Okie doke.
25
26 Council President Knapp,
27 Okay.
28
29 Councilmember Floreen,
30 Moving right along. Traffic improvements.
31
32 Council President Knapp,
33 Hold on. Oh, do you want, can we wrap up these and then come back to Montrose? Are
34 these pretty quick?
35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 Well.
38
39 Council President Knapp,
40 That's okay. Let's do that.
41
42 Councilmember Floreen,
43 Yeah.
44



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,
2 We can run through.
3
4 Councilmember Floreen,
5 Well, that was my plan at least.
6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Run through those quickly.
9
10 Councilmember Floreen,
11 This involves some schedule changes, modest improvements on a consent list.
12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 Is there anything where you all didn't agree with these? It looked like it was all 3-0 with
15 the Executive.
16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 Yeah.
19
20 Council President Knapp,
21 Want to see if anybody has questions?
22
23 Councilmember Floreen,
24 Let me just see here. No, there's nothing terribly exciting here, but I just wanted to
25 highlight that this is the kind of stuff that a lot of people raise issues about which is
26 intersection and spot improvements. It's lighting.
27
28 Council President Knapp,
29 -- taking great offense at the fact that it is not very exciting or interesting.
30
31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 Well we think it's exciting but it is intersection and spot improvements items, it's
33 pedestrian lighting. We get a lot of concern about that. It's traffic signal system
34 modification, modernization which is a huge issue and can make a big difference in
35 traffic flow and management. So we are all agreeing with each other on these initiatives.
36
37 Council President Knapp,
38 Okay.
39
40 Councilmember Floreen,
41 Okay.
42
43 Council President Knapp,
44 Councilmember Andrews.



March 11, 2008

Councilmember Andrews,

Thank you. On the intersection spot improvements, I think this is one the areas of the budget that I would like to see increased. I think this is the most cost effective way to have impact on traffic congestion. I point to the project that was done a couple years ago at Muddy Branch Road and Great Seneca Highway and at Great Seneca and Sam Eig- where those improvements, adding a through lane at Great Seneca Muddy Branch as you go south, adding a longer left turn lane, adding a dedicated right turn lane and then the controlled entry now off of Sam Eig onto Great Seneca, those have made a huge difference. Traffic used to back up a mile typically in the morning from Muddy Branch on Great Seneca towards the Kentlands and now traffic is free flowing pretty much during all of rush hour, much better than it used to be, much, much better for a modest investment compared to what we pay for many projects. And jumping just a little bit ahead I think that is where we're going to, I think putting more money in intersection spot improvements and widening some targeted roads is a much better approach than putting money, for example into Montrose Parkway East and I don't think Montrose Parkway West was a good investment of \$70 million. My reaction on driving on it was, is that all we get for \$70 million and I think we can get much more effective traffic relieve in putting the money into intersection spot improvements and targeted road widening like Muncaster Mill Road, or Norbeck and 28, getting that done with the state and some others. So that's what I think is the most effective way to relieve traffic and I hope that we can find a way to increase the amount of money that we put into this CIP and the intersection spot improvements.

Council President Knapp,

My only comment on this area less Mr. Wolanin think we don't appreciate him, no this is, I appreciate the efforts. We've had a number of areas, especially as the Up County has grown and there've been new traffic patterns and places where there weren't neighborhoods and now there are neighborhoods and places where people didn't cross the street and now they do, that you guys have worked very well to work with us to try and come up with ways to do that and with the State Highway Administration to make sure that we get the right pedestrian requirements and signalization out there and as quickly as possible. And I know that there are lots of times when the community wants one thing and a stop sign or traffic signal that we have to work through and you've been very helpful in helping us get that done and I appreciate that.

Councilmember Andrews,

Real quick. Does someone have, Edgar, you may have this on the top of your head, what was the cost of the intersection improvements at Great Seneca and Muddy Branch and – and Great Seneca? Do you recall?

Edgar Gonzalez,

On the magnitude of [INAUDIBLE].



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Andrews,
2 Okay. Alright and huge impact on traffic relief in that area.

3
4 Council President Knapp,
5 Okay.

6
7 Councilmember Floreen,
8 Okay.

9
10 Council President Knapp,
11 No other questions on this set?

12
13 Councilmember Floreen,
14 Then we'll go back to Montrose Parkway East, let's see, which is on circle 27 and on.

15
16 Unidentified
17 Page 27.

18
19 Councilmember Floreen,
20 Page 27 and on. Glenn has included a lot of the back and forth and the conversations
21 that have occurred with respect to this. This is in the, this is not something that the
22 Committee added. This is in the County Executive's budget. It is the sole project in the
23 County Executive's budget as I understand it that actually adds roadway capacity, is
24 that correct Mr. Orlin?

25
26 Glenn Orlin,
27 That's correct.

28
29 Councilmember Floreen,
30 It is the only project that adds roadway capacity.

31
32 Glenn Orlin,
33 Significant. Significant roadway capacity.

34
35 Councilmember Floreen,
36 In Montgomery County. I will repeat that, it is the only project that adds significant
37 roadway capacity in Montgomery County. It would build about a mile of a four lane road
38 with parkway features between Parklawn Drive and Veers Mill Road. This is a master
39 planned roadway, it will include a hiker biker trail and a sidewalk. It is programmed for,
40 to be, for design and land acquisition to be completed by fiscal year '11 and
41 construction would be finished by fiscal year '14. There is a considerable amount of
42 discussion in here about some of the history on this and there are conversations that
43 have fully been completed with Park and Planning. However, basically, Glenn can talk a



March 11, 2008

1 little bit about the need for this. Do you want to talk about the capacity issues and the
2 forecast that this roadway is intended to address Glenn?

3
4 Glenn Orlin,

5 Sure. The forecasts that were done by DPWT based on Park and Planning's models go
6 out to year 2020 which is actually not as far out as most forecasts go these days. They
7 usually go out to 2030. But in 2020 the forecast shows about 2200 vehicles per hour
8 heading inbound, westbound in the morning and about the same amount, different
9 number in the evening. It would provide significant relief to Randolph Road which is the
10 point of Montrose Parkway, and of course, that's true if Montrose Parkway is connected
11 all the way through to the 355 Montrose Interchange and there are two sets of issues in
12 this project. One is the design of the four lane road project itself, there are aspects to it,
13 particularly, and that's mostly pointed out in the back and forth between Park and
14 Planning Commission and DPWT as a result of their mandatory referral comments so
15 there's that aspect of it and Larry Cole is here from Park and Planning to speak to those
16 but the letter and the response is in the packet. And then of course the second issue
17 which is not so much what do you build if it's a four lane road, but whether you build it
18 and/or when do you build it and that gets the question of do you build a road if it doesn't
19 connect all the way across to the interchange? In the analysis that I did looking at the
20 forecasts, it appears that without the connection between Parkline Drive, actually, it
21 would be better if we had the map. You guys have the map, right?

22
23 Councilmember Floreen,

24 I think the fundamental issue associated with this roadway is that it's needed regardless
25 of whatever comes out of the White Flint master planning effort. Right, Glenn?

26
27 Glenn Orlin,
28 Right.

29
30 Councilmember Floreen,
31 That's a yes.

32
33 Glenn Orlin,
34 That's a yes.

35
36 Councilmember Floreen,
37 And so the residents of North Bethesda are going to be, are projected to need this
38 under current planning.

39
40 Glenn Orlin,
41 A little background. Like all Montrose Parkways in four parts.

42
43 Council President Knapp,
44 Keep it fairly short.



March 11, 2008

Glenn Orlin,

I will. Montrose Parkway West goes to here, goes from 270 over to old Old Georgetown Road behind -- Plaza. That'll be finished next year. The second piece is the part that's under construction, just starting construction now which is the interchange from Old Georgetown Road to this point where it connects to the eastside of the pike. Montrose Parkway will go under the pike. The pike will not have a traffic light here anymore. There'll be a traffic light at this point for the ramps. The third piece which is not programmed yet, it's in the state's D&E Program, their planning program, but it's not programmed for construction, would extend from this point over the CSX tracks and connect to Parklawn Drive with an interchange at this point. Without the Montrose Parkway East, the state's designs would actually go across the tracks and tie back in to Randolph Road which would actually double the cost of their project. Instead of being about 57 million it'd be in the order of 120 million I think, it's in the packet, I can't remember the exact number. It's because of a huge number of commercial impacts in this location. And then the fourth piece, and I'm not doing this, not in order, I'm just going from west to east is Montrose Parkway East which will go from Parklawn Drive, or actually where the state's project ends up over to Veirs Mill Road and includes some improvements at Veirs Mill Road because of the turning lanes. And the question that was raised in the packet was, do you build a four lane road to this point without having this piece committed? And what the Committee decided was yes to do it and to take every effort possible to move up this piece in the priority list. The priority list won't be done until June but we had a discussion, everyone I think agreed that it should be either the number one or the number two priority on that list, the other one being the I-270 Watkins Road Interchange. But that's yet to be decided. And then even to consider talking with the state about accelerating the design of this project, even perhaps with County money out of the state transportation participation project so as to get this project moving. Alternatively, if you think that this, for whatever reason, this connection can't be made in this generation, then the alternative I put out in the packet is to build two of the four lanes of Montrose Parkway because there is enough demand to warrant two lanes really in the next five years which is when we could actually have this thing built because of traffic that's coming just from Twinbrook and just from this area of Parklawn Drive which would rather use Montrose Parkway to get over to Veirs Mill Road rather than Randolph Road which has a lot of traffic signals and a lot of houses facing the street. It's a much more difficult road for drivers but also for residents along the road. The Committee again unanimously recommends four lanes to this point as per the Park and Planning, I'm sorry, as per the Executive. The only other caveat they would add is over here at Veirs Mill Road they would recommend adding language to say that the Veirs Mill Road BRT be considered in the design of this because what happens, and there's a circle number in your packet which shows the intersection. There are several turn lanes that are being added at this intersection the single left turn lane is being made a triple left turn lane here and an additional through lane and right turn lane is being provided on the southbound part of Veirs Mill Road. And the thought is that if, the worry is, that with that additional width, is there enough roomy eventually for the BRT?



March 11, 2008

1 And the Committee's response is to say that, to the Department that when you're
2 designing this, take the BRT into consideration. That's the Committee's
3 recommendation.

4
5 Councilmember Floreen,

6 So, the issue with this, this effort which the Committee supports is to address current,
7 planned capacity needs that we know are out there by 2020 as well, and this will have
8 the incidental benefit of relieving to a certain extent at least, some of the pressures on
9 Randolph Road. Finally, it puts us in a position to bargain with the state to address that
10 other piece that needs to be done at a significant advantage to the state and to the
11 residents and businesses of this neck of the road, of the area. There is no question that
12 the north, I don't remember all the machinations of different property owners with
13 respect to the north Bethesda initiatives, but what they are looking at I think can, if they
14 can find a way to deliver the cash, can be worked into the later project design in this
15 area. But to not do it is a significant issue for the County and as I said it is the only
16 initiative that's adding real roadway capacity.

17
18 Art Holmes,

19 I asked the staff to put together some points here in favor of this and some of the things
20 that would go with it and we've also already been talking to the state at the staff level
21 about the, forgetting about coming down to Parklawn and then saving them about \$50
22 million and have one continuous road rather than having the traffic then fall back into
23 Randolph Road.

24
25 Councilmember Floreen,
26 Randolph Road. Thanks.

27
28 Council President Knapp,
29 Okay.

30
31 Councilmember Floreen,
32 So, that's the Committee recommendation.

33
34 Council President Knapp,
35 Okay. So we have before us the Committee recommendation and as I understand it
36 there is obviously folks that agree and disagree. I would point to my colleagues that this
37 is our last item for the day and I think, at least from what I counted so far, anything gets
38 to just about a 4-4 tie which means nothing changes much. So I just want to put that out
39 there, but I also, right, but I also want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to
40 ask questions and to make sure that their perspective is shared so people know
41 everybody, will know where everyone is and so I'm just going to work my way down the
42 aisle. Start with Councilmember Elrich on the end and work our way down to the other
43 end.



March 11, 2008

1 Councilmember Elrich,

2 I don't support this project absent the state doing their completion over the railroad
3 tracks. This road was number seven or number eight on our priority list and so I don't
4 understand how it jumps over six other roads except for a matter of, you know, there
5 must be some reasoning but I don't see it, I mean, I know that there's great concern
6 about Norbeck even with the ICC, George mentioned Cedar Lane and he mentioned
7 Brookville Bypass just for a few. We've got whatever BRAC does that they won't
8 adequately fund for improvements and then we're going to be stuck with trying to deal
9 with that, so in the scheme of all the things out there the fact that I would rather put
10 money into buying buses, I agree with Phil's comment about doing more spot
11 intersection improvements and I would rather take this money and increase the funding
12 for the road maintenance if it's in the budget. I can see doing a lot of transportation
13 things and not doing this thing because it has minimal impact unless and until the state
14 builds the bridge segment over the railroad track and Glenn said as much in the copy
15 room that, you know, when you raise the question or I asked you whether it was even
16 worth it without the state doing the segment over the railroad track and I just don't
17 believe that given the circumstances this is going to be a this generation project. This is
18 going to be a next generation project.

19
20 Glenn Orlin,

21 I think what I said in the copy room is that a two lane road is justifiable anyway even
22 without the connection if we can get the guarantee that the state will build the project or
23 it's a joint project within a few years after, or hopefully even concurrent with, but no
24 longer than a few years after this project then it's worthwhile doing it now. But if for
25 whatever reason the Council feels, and this is really your call, obviously it's all your call,
26 but it's your judgment particularly in this case is that if you think that middle piece is not
27 going to be provided in this generation and call that 15, 20 years, then I think a two lane
28 road is all that's warranted here for the time being.

29
30 Councilmember Elrich,

31 If I was going to build a two lane road to spend, you estimate, you said it was about 30
32 to 35 million for the two lanes.

33
34 Glenn Orlin,

35 That's my guesstimate based on information.

36
37 Councilmember Elrich,

38 And I'm looking at a lot of buses and a lot of other things that we could be doing in the
39 mass transit area that we're not doing. I mean, you said earlier Mr. Holmes that, you
40 know, you could do BRT up Veers Mill or up Georgia Avenue if there's money in the
41 budget. One reason there's no money in the budget for a project like that is because
42 there's money in the budget for this project. This is where, you know, we get to make, at
43 least I feel we ought to be making choices between transit projects and road projects
44 and if I was going to invest in a project, I'd say let's start putting the money into one of



March 11, 2008

1 the two BRT lines rather than advancing this particular road project particularly without a
2 guarantee that the state's going to do its segment. And this is, I think it would be a
3 mistake to do this and just leave everybody hanging at Parklawn. And I kind of question
4 the numbers going, I mean, one thing that's missing from here is like a real traffic
5 analysis. I mean, you have gross numbers in here. You say these many vehicles, these
6 many vehicles, you know, leaving, but you don't say where they're going and, you know,
7 the big problem is, you know, getting on to 355. The goal of this is to pour more traffic
8 on to 355. What North Bethesda residents benefit, I kind of question because there's, I
9 mean, how much traffic out of North Bethesda is going to Veirs Mill Road. Because if I
10 was going to Rockville, I'd be going straight up the pike, there are no jobs at Veirs Mill
11 and Wheaton is not a job center.

12
13 Glenn Orlin,

14 Forty percent of the traffic that's on Montrose Parkway East, according to the forecast,
15 is coming from Parklawn Drive either north or south and about 60% would be coming
16 from the missing link, if you will, and what that means is that it's probably about two
17 lanes is what is justified, that's how I came to the idea of two lanes if you don't have the
18 missing link. It also means, this sort of gets to the other point that you raised earlier that
19 Federal Realty has been going around saying, you know, we need to have no
20 interchange here, there are two reasons why that's frankly I think a bad idea. And I'm
21 just going to take that opportunity to say that. One is that although the general idea of
22 providing more streets and shorter blocks is a great idea and it will reduce the need for
23 a lot of other road improvements in White Flint and it probably get rid of the idea of
24 having to have an interchange which is now in the master plan at 355 and Nicholson
25 Lane, that can go away, but don't forget Montrose Road, Randolph Road is not just a
26 way of getting to the pike, it is a way of getting people across the County to 270. And
27 you need a way of getting people through there efficiently and you don't want them
28 mixing with frankly the urban fabric that's happening on the surface. So, and there's two
29 by --there. It's not just 355, there's also the railroad tracks. And there's only a few places
30 where long distance traffic can go across the railroad tracks, so I think on the basis of
31 just pure functionality of transportation regionally, you do need to have an interchange
32 at this location and the grade separation. That's why I feel strongly the project needs to
33 be done. The other part of it is really more the, frankly, the there goes Montgomery
34 County again aspect of things. This was the number one project on our priority list for
35 years. Not only that, we find, that was the one, we had two projects out of the last
36 revenue increase, not the one a year ago, but for five years ago, this was one of them,
37 and the other thing we got and we decided was we were unhappy with how fast this was
38 happening so the County itself just last summer put up 14 and a half million dollars to
39 accelerate it and now we turn around and say, oh, never mind. That makes us look
40 frankly, I just have to say it, I think that makes us look idiotic. Particularly when the
41 project, on a project like this. And so, at some point you have to say, okay, the horse is
42 out of the barn. This is needed for regional transportation. It is actually a benefit to the
43 White Flint area anyway because it takes a lot of through traffic out and it shows that



March 11, 2008

1 we're actually good with our commitments over a period of time. So, sorry about
2 reacting.

3
4 Councilmember Elrich,
5 I've heard so much.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Glenn, do you feel passionately about this issue?

9
10 Glenn Orlin,
11 Yeah, a little bit.

12
13 Councilmember Elrich,
14 Glenn.

15
16 Councilmember Floreen,
17 Idiotic is a technical term.

18
19 Councilmember Elrich,
20 If we're going to raise the state in this, I mean, I've got to say, I met with Mr. Picari about
21 two months ago and one of the things he said to me is that, which priority list are you
22 talking about and is your priority list ever going to stay in the same order? So you know,
23 changing this again is not, you know, is not exactly a way to win points with the state.

24
25 Art Holmes,
26 Well, it.

27
28 Glenn Orlin,
29 That's true.

30
31 Art Holmes,
32 It was changed I think every year. We have had this one with some priorities now for
33 about two years or so. And I think that as you come forward, certainly you don't want to
34 have a bouncing ball, but there are circumstances and there are opportunities that you
35 ought to take regardless of what you have there on the priority list at that particular time.

36
37 Councilmember Elrich,
38 May I ask a question? I'm going to follow up on that. Would Watkins, if we did this and
39 you made this number one and Watkins Mill becomes number two, so does Watkins Mill
40 become the second generation project?

41
42 Glenn Orlin,
43 It all depends on what the revenues that are going to come from the state. We got a
44 revenue increase four years ago, we got two projects. We got a revenue increase this



March 11, 2008

1 time which got us, frankly, one project. Well, with some BRAC money too. If there was
2 another revenue increase in four more years, which gives us a similar amount of,
3 frankly, pretty incremental funding, some would call it peanuts, we would get one or two
4 more projects. So yeah, I think we could get if it's number one or number two.

5
6 Edgar Gonzalez,

7 And the other thing is that we are considering a split of Watkins Mill into the bridge
8 which is going to be significantly less expensive and it will still provide relief to the two
9 major intersections of state roads, with state roads, Montgomery Village and 355 and
10 Clopper and Quince Orchard. That bridge along, and that is going to reduce significantly
11 so you can have still that as your priority number one. This could be priority number two
12 and the rest of the interchange priority number three. But that's something that needs to
13 be discussed. The project is not only a capacity project, it's also a safety project. I
14 mean, the existing Randolph Road has a hundred points of intersections in this stretch
15 of road. So it's only a safety issue. You have like 93 driveways on this stretch of
16 Randolph and seven major intersections. That makes it 100, 100 points of potential
17 accidents. The accident rate on this stretch of Randolph, unless we make
18 improvements, I mean, Mr. Leventhal talked about the difference that you have between
19 Montrose Road and Montrose Parkway. You don't have as much friction. It's a much
20 safer road so that's one component.

21
22 Glenn Orlin,

23 Actually Edgar, the safety thing you didn't put down here on your list which I thought
24 would be number one is the fire safety aspect of it. We have the fire station right there.

25
26 Edgar Gonzalez,

27 But I can go on and on and on.

28
29 Council President Knapp,

30 But let's not.

31
32 Edgar Gonzalez,

33 For an hour.

34
35 Council President Knapp,

36 Let's get to Councilmember Trachtenberg.

37
38 Glenn Orlin,

39 Sorry.

40
41 Council President Knapp,

42 And ask her questions and work our way down the line.

43
44 Councilmember Trachtenberg,



March 11, 2008

1 Well, I .

2
3 Unidentified

4 That's yours.

5
6 Council President Knapp,
7 Let's try to keep moving forward.

8
9 Councilmember Trachtenberg,

10 I actually don't have questions and I'll try to be brief in my pontification. I live in that area
11 and I have for 20 years, and, you know, there is clearly an attempt to bring the North
12 Bethesda area, make it an urban setting. That's very clear. With that in mind, what I
13 believe is that we should not be making a commitment on this parkway at this time until
14 the White Flint Master Plan has been completed. The focus clearly needs to be on use
15 of mass transit and that means addressing access to that transit and an integral part of
16 that has to be pedestrian safety and that, in my mind, is the biggest issue that I have
17 seen and continue to see as a critical need in the community that I live in and that I do
18 represent in this office, and it would seem to me that the grade separation issues and
19 the overpass of the CSX tracks, they're state projects. So, they need to be coordinated,
20 so what I see in this is that there should be no final action taken until the master plan is
21 resolved and until there is some agreement with the state about both the separation and
22 the tracks and I don't, I find it interesting that at this point my position on this is identical
23 to the development community that believes precisely the same thing because they
24 understand that what's going on right now in that area is an urban development model.
25 That's what they're looking to develop. They're looking to move away from the suburban
26 setting and to me it's, you know, driving on that new end of the Montrose Parkway, yes,
27 it's a much more pleasant drive and it's a much more appealing roadway than Montrose
28 Road, but using it at all hours of the day and night, I can assure you that the congestion
29 that you were attempting to deal with is still quite significant. I was on the roadway on
30 Sunday backed up in traffic just the other day, so I understand why we wanted to make
31 improvements to deal with congestion, but at the same time we have to deal with the
32 fact that we're trying to get people to the Metro both to Twinbrook and White Flint and
33 that the way we do that is providing safe streets and sidewalks for them. So I'd like to
34 see at this time much more of a focus with the use of this resource around intersection
35 improvements and also increasing bus capacity. I just don't see this as being a really
36 good priority and I felt like I needed to let you know that that's the way I felt and it's not
37 just from a policy perspective. It's from someone who lives there and who has worked in
38 that area for a good 20 years because that is where I have both driven to work and
39 walked to work so I'd like to see us delay any kind of commitment to this at this time.

40
41 Council President Knapp,
42 Councilmember Andrews.

43
44 Councilmember Andrews,



March 11, 2008

1 Thank you. Well, I'm not going to support moving it up on the priority list. I think those
2 other priorities are well established and very important to go forward with, whether it's
3 the interchange at Watkins Mill and 270 or the Brookville Bypass or other roads,
4 Norbeck, that are in there, in the priority list. I think we have to recognize there's a limit
5 to what can be added to the CIP. I want to add the entrance at the Bethesda Metro but
6 that, in my view, competes directly with this, they're about the same amount of money,
7 same years in the CIP. I don't see how we can do both and I think we're going to have
8 to make some hard choices in terms of what direction we go in and I think that this is a
9 project that is not a good use of funds compared to what else we can spend the money
10 on and we don't have the luxury of spreading money around to a lot of projects. So I
11 think that we should take this, not show this as being funded, at least in this CIP, in
12 terms of any construction.

13
14 Council President Knapp,
15 Councilmember Berliner.

16
17 Councilmember Berliner,
18 Thank you Council President. I, not being on the Committee, this was the first
19 conversation that I've heard with respect to this project, whereas one understands the
20 implications of adding subway entrances in Bethesda, the implications of this are a little
21 more daunting to come to grapple with at the end of a long day, particularly when we've
22 had the Department, I think appropriately so, give us a couple pages that underscore
23 from their point of view why this is important. I hear in my mind Councilmember
24 Leventhal saying some things are complicated, catch up and I'm trying to catch up with
25 respect to this, but I am not comfortable at making a decision with respect to this matter
26 at 20 after 4:00, having heard this for the first time is the most rational of decision
27 making processes and I would ask my colleagues if they would be prepared to defer
28 action on this so that we could engage in a little more conversation privately with the
29 Department and others so that we can have more information with respect to this. I
30 personally think it's unlikely that the state is going to accelerate its piece given the
31 budgetary constraints that the state faces and need to understand how it is that we
32 would commit these kinds of dollars in the absence of the state moving forward. I don't
33 understand the implications of this with respect to the White Flint Sector Plan and the
34 vision people have with respect to that. We will know that soon because this Council's
35 going to be acting on the White Flint Sector Plan I suspect this year. So to act on this
36 now without the benefit of knowing how it's integrated, I'm not prepared to do that and
37 would ask if it was possible, Council President, I've talked with you informally and I
38 understand that we have severe scheduling concerns but this is a big dollar item. It took
39 up three pages, four pages of a 110 page packet which was one of 13 packets that we
40 had before us today and I just don't think it's a good way to run a railroad and would
41 urge us to try and find an alternative way that this matter could come back to us with a
42 benefit of more consultation so that we can make a more informed judgment.

43
44 Council President Knapp,



March 11, 2008

1 Well, let me just respond, Councilmember Leventhal has questions. I appreciate the
2 issue and unfortunately that is the constraint that we're struck with within the CIP. I
3 would humbly submit however given the presentation that Dr. Orlin presented to us this
4 morning at 9:50 as it related to the \$300 million differential that we currently had within
5 the CIP of where we are and where we need to get to that virtually every project we
6 have approved is to some degree still in play and so I think it's going to be important for
7 the Council to come back and we're going to have to reconcile this. So I think that we
8 have a Committee recommendation before us which keeps pieces in play, but I think the
9 Council's still going to have to come back and reconcile a number of pieces of which
10 this will likely be one of them as a big ticket item. So I think all today is is an effort to
11 make sure that things are on a list and then we take the next step. So I appreciate the
12 concerns that you've raised and I would submit that if you'd like to have additional
13 conversations with the Department or with colleagues that we're going to have some
14 time since the ultimate CIP isn't approved until we get there in May, there's a lot of work
15 for us to be done to actually get to some balancing of that CIP. Councilmember
16 Leventhal.

17
18 Councilmember Leventhal,

19 Well, we are as a Council going to have to cut some things out of the CIP and I
20 acknowledge that but I just would respond to my good friend the Council Vice-President
21 that, as I explained earlier, the funds for the Bethesda South Metro came out of a PDF
22 that was already in the CIP so that didn't add cost to the CIP and this matter that we're
23 discussing now is in the CIP that was sent to us from the County Executive. So neither
24 of these projects are additional money beyond what the County Executive sent over and
25 I guess I have to question, I really would like to know of those of my colleagues who
26 have expressed, particularly Mr. Elrich, who have expressed such strong opposition to
27 it, I'm not sure who in the community is, are my colleagues being responsive to. I vividly
28 recall the debate over Montrose Parkway West. Vividly. It was playing out when I got
29 here and the Council voted to go ahead with the final authorization and there were
30 landowners who lost their homes. I mean, it wasn't pretty. It was a big dispute. But
31 having now, but what I also recall about Montrose Parkway West was that we were
32 being accused of building a road to nowhere, that the worst thing about the Montrose, I
33 mean, look, if you're losing your home it's terrible and I have sympathy with people who
34 have to deal with adverse takings even if it is for a good public purpose, I understand
35 and I understood what motivated the intensity of opposition to that. But one of the
36 arguments that were made was it was a road to nowhere and it seems to me that what
37 we're doing here is we're making sure it isn't a road to nowhere, that it's a road to
38 somewhere, that it's a road to mid-county, that it's a road to Veirs Mill, that it's a road to
39 Aspen Hill, and Wheaton, and Twinbrook, and Rockville, and that it improves throughput
40 in the most congested part of the mid-county area right at the border of the city of
41 Rockville. So it seems to me that those who argued against Montrose Parkway West
42 because it didn't lead anywhere, for those advocates now to argue against Montrose
43 Parkway East which would make sure that Montrose Parkway West does take you
44 somewhere is a bit of a circular argument and, frankly, I'm confused because I haven't



March 11, 2008

1 heard any opposition to this. I haven't got, maybe the e-mails are going to my
2 colleagues and not to me. Unlike Montrose Parkway West, I'm not hearing from folks in
3 Aspen Hill that they don't support this or, I just haven't heard it so I'm not sure where the
4 opposition is coming from. I'd be, maybe, now having said that, I'll get a bunch of e-
5 mails, you know, tonight.

6
7 Council President Knapp,
8 Now you know.

9
10 Councilmember Trachtenberg,
11 You will.

12
13 Councilmember Leventhal,
14 And finally, I mean, and I think the question is apt about, you know, should we not
15 hasten programming of a bus way on Veirs Mill Road or a bus way on Georgia Avenue,
16 I'd love to see that. We do to some extent rely upon our career professional
17 transportation planners and then we push them to adopt policies that we support, so I'd
18 be the first one to vote in favor of a PDF to hasten construction and design and planning
19 and construction of a Veirs Mill bus rapid transit way. I'd love to see that occur. Let's do
20 that. Let's hasten that. But I don't have enough information about what that would cost
21 or how that would work to do that myself. There was enough information out there about
22 the Bethesda South Metro Entrance that I felt confident that I could propose a PDF that
23 accurately described what that project would look like. I'm in favor of programming funds
24 in transit. I'm in favor of expediting transit. If we could jumpstart Corridor Cities Transit
25 Way, if we could jumpstart these two bus ways on Veers Mill and Georgia, I'd be in
26 favor of that. I just don't have the knowledge to do it. I don't have enough information
27 and I don't think any of us do to propose a PDF in this CIP that would enable us to
28 jumpstart those important projects, but I have to say relieving congestion in mid-county
29 and providing a way to get cars off of Randolph, off of Norbeck, improving throughput in
30 that congested part of the County, Veirs Mill Road I drive home almost every day on it,
31 it's very backed up, it's very difficult at the intersection with Aspen Hill Road, at the
32 intersection with Twinbrook Parkway. It seems to me this would alleviate that problem if
33 it were connected the whole way through, it sounds to me like a valid and meritorious
34 project. And then finally, if for some, I mean, as it says in the PDF, this project is a four
35 lane divided parkway as recommended in the existing master plans for North Bethesda,
36 Garrett Park and Aspen Hill. Now if, in the course of the White Flint Sector Plan, this
37 Council should go in a dramatically different direction, we do make changes from time to
38 time, I'm sorry to hear the story of what our friend Secretary Picari said, which priority
39 list, but the reality is sometime we change directions, sometimes we change plans. The
40 idea that we should not act on this CIP item now while we're considering the CIP
41 because a few months from now we're going to take up the White Flint Sector Plan, I'm
42 sorry, there's a certain timing and a rhythm and a schedule to the way the Council acts
43 on things and we have the CIP before us now. If for some reason we decide that this is
44 a horrible mistake, which I don't feel like it is, and then we adopt a very different White



March 11, 2008

1 Flint Sector Plan that's dramatically inconsistent with the existing North Bethesda
2 Garrett Park plan, which according to the PDF already calls for this, well, then we'd
3 have a couple of years that, we're not constructing this for a couple of years anyway so
4 we could still change it later to make it consistent with the Sector Plan. But I don't, I'd be
5 surprised if the Sector Plan contradicted this or said that this is a bad idea. So my
6 inclination, obviously as I voted in Committee, is to stick with County Executive Leggett
7 on this who certainly, at least the way he conveys himself, is not, it's not, he's not trying
8 to open the door for, there's no secret plan here, he's just trying to, you know, improve
9 congestion in the mid-county. Sometimes I feel I have to remind at least one of my
10 colleagues that Ike Leggett is County Executive now and some of the campaigns of the
11 past are behind us.

12
13 Council President Knapp,
14 Okay. Councilmember Elrich in response to questions that were just asked and unless
15 there's a motion before us, we'll move on to.

16
17 Councilmember Floreen,
18 Move on to dinner.

19
20 Councilmember Elrich,
21 Without, I'm not going to rehash all the old discussions about Montrose Parkway, I'd just
22 say, you know, my opposition and the opposition of a lot of other people I knew had
23 nothing to do with a road to nowhere, it had to do with the impact on the pike and the
24 fact that the congestion relief people thought could just have easily been offered by the
25 double turning lane that was later built on Montrose Road after construction of the
26 Parkway had begun which effectively relieved the problem on Montrose Road. Leaving
27 that aside, I mean, driving home as I often do the way you do, what you and I are going
28 to buy out of this is several extra blocks of congestion on Veirs Mill Road because this
29 thing terminates on Veers Mill and so if this is taking cars off of Randolph, we will run
30 into those cars now at the intersection of Montrose Parkway. I mean, George, your point
31 was that it'll relieve congestion for us, I'm just suggesting this will not relieve congestion
32 for us going down Veirs Mill Road.

33
34 Councilmember Leventhal,
35 I don't know.

36
37 Councilmember Elrich,
38 I'm not saying it has the, it's not, well, you gave the example and I'm just saying that for
39 our ride there's not necessarily any benefit out of this, but the more important question
40 which you raised is, you know, the other thing is, there's not a PDF for any of these
41 other things and, you know, frankly, I would say I fault the planning in general in the
42 County for the fact that there's no PDF for any bus ways or any mass transit because
43 that's a decision that people make on the other side of the street and I, like you, share
44 an interest in greatly expanding mass transit over there. But if roads continue to be the



March 11, 2008

1 priority and we see PDF's for this and they eat up large amounts of capacity in the
2 capital budget then you're not going to see a PDF for a bus way. There will always be a
3 road and the roads are very expensive. This is a mile long road for \$50 million. I agree
4 this is money that you want to jumpstart CCT, this is money that could go, you know, to
5 aspects of CCT, I could think of lots of transit projects that this could help but instead
6 the PDF is for a road project and I'm suggesting maybe this Council needs to say that
7 the PDF's needs to start reflecting a transit priority, not a road priority. Transit adds
8 capacity just like roads add capacity, but our instinct and our history in the County has
9 been to look at adding capacity by adding roads and I think we need to look otherwise.

10
11 Councilmember Floreen,
12 Okay, in conclusion, let me just, I really.

13
14 Council President Knapp,
15 Alright, I'll let the Council Chair, I'll let the Chair of the Committee and you've got about
16 30 seconds.

17
18 Councilmember Floreen,
19 Which is, it is great where we are. I would say, I would agree with you, Marc, if we didn't
20 have in place a growth policy that absolutely prioritize roadway capacity in terms of
21 mobility. And those things.

22
23 Council President Knapp,
24 Wait, we're almost done.

25
26 Councilmember Floreen,
27 Those things have driven capacity, calculations, pedestrian unfriendly interchanges and
28 pedestrian unfriendly roadways for years and years and years.

29
30 Council President Knapp,
31 Okay.

32
33 Councilmember Floreen,
34 But there we go.

35
36 Council President Knapp,
37 I commend the Chair and the Committee and the other Committees that acted today. It
38 was very good. I want to go back to one point which I apologize for. Item number three,
39 the Clarksburg Road Bridge, looking at it I would like to make a motion to actually
40 include that back in or accelerate it as proposed.

41
42 Councilmember Andrews,
43 I'll second the President's motion on putting the Clarksburg Bridge in.



March 11, 2008

1 Council President Knapp,
2 Sure.

3
4 Councilmember Andrews,
5 Because I think it is, the way it's described it certainly appears to be both an important
6 and urgent safety issue with the bridge.

7
8 Councilmember Floreen,
9 I'll third.

10
11 Council President Knapp,
12 Okay. Any objection? I don't see any. Okay. Thank you all very much. We are
13 adjourned. Thank you from the Department for your efforts and happy birthday to
14 Councilmember Trachtenberg.

15